00032718

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016

LECTURES

ON

ANCIENT ETHNOGRAPHY AND GEOGRAPHY,

COMPRISING

GREECE AND HER COLONIES, EPIRUS, MACEDONIA, ILLYRICUM, ITALY, GAUL, SPAIN, BRITAIN, THE NORTH OF AFRICA, ETC.

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH

BY

B. G. NIEBUHR.

32718

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN EDITION OF DR. ISLER, BY

DR. LEONHARD SCHMITZ, F.R.S.E.

RECTOR OF THE HIGH SCHOOL OF EDINBURGH.

WITH ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS FROM HIS OWN MS. NOTES.

AA-2-20

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

WALTON AND MABERLY,

UPPER GOWER STREET, AND IVY LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.DCCC.LII.

572
Nic/Loc
32718
Ref: C111.3

LONDON:
PRINTED BY J. WHITTINGHAM AND C.
CHERUB PLACE, BELL YARD, DEAN'S.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

	PAGE.
ITALY, its name	1
Population	3
Physical character	10
Divisions of Italy	13
Latium	30
Extent of Latium	31
Latin Colonies	32
Jus Latii, Latinitas	33
Different names of the Latini	33
Physical condition of Latium	37
TOPOGRAPHY OF ROME	41
The most ancient parts	41
The Seven Hills, Septimontium	42
The Agger of Servius Tullius	43
Further extension	43
The Regions of Augustus	44
Nature of the ground	46
The Cloacae	47
Fortification of ancient towns	48
Course of the ancient walls of Rome	48
The Marrana	50
Suburbs	52
Extension of the city	52
Tombs	52
Horti, Villae	53
The Wall of Aurelian	57
The Gates	59
Roads	62
Interior of Rome	65
The Capitoline Hill	65
Clivus, Semita	65
Streets of Rome	66

PAGE.

The Asylum, the Tarpeian Rock 66
The Capitoline Temple 67
Parts of ancient temples 67
The *Carcer* 69
The Forum Romanum 69
The Comitium 73
The Rostra 73
The Curia Hostilia 75
The Curia Julia 76
Buildings of the Forum Romanum 77
Basilicae 79
Other Fora 80
Vicus, Pagus 86
Platea 87
Aqueducts 87
Circi 88
Theatres 90
Amphitheatres 90
Thermae 93
The Palatine 96
Via Sacra, Velia 98
Triumphal arches 98
Subura 98
Carinae 99
The Quirinal 99
The Esquiline, Caelius, Aventine 99
Suburbs 100
Campi 100
Moles Hadriani 101
Trastevere 103
Bridges 103
Insula Tiberina 104
The rest of Latium 105
The Hernicans 116
The Volscians and Aequians 119
Campania 127
The Sabellians, Sabines, Samnites 141
Sabellian confederations 142
The Lucanians 144
The Bruttians 144
Constitution of the Sabellians 145
Country of the Sabines proper 147
Picenum 150
The Upper Confederation of the Marsians, Pelignians, Marrucinians, and Vestinians 153
The Marsians 156

PAGE
The Pelignians ... 157
The Marrucinians ... 157
The Vestinians ... 157
The Samnites ... 158
The Samnite Tribes ... 160
The Frentanians ... 161
The Pentrians ... 161
The Caudines ... 161
The Hirpinians ... 161
Apulia ... 168
Poediculi, Peucetii ... 175
Messapia ... 177
Ancient Oenotria ... 179
The Lucanians ... 182
The Bruttians ... 183
Greek towns on the coast of Italy ... 185
Magna Graecia ... 188
The Achaean towns ... 190
Locri ... 199
The Chalcidian towns ... 202
Etruria ... 206
The Faliscans ... 229
Umbria ... 231
Gallia Cisalpina or Togata ... 234
The Boians ... 236
Gallic tribes in northern Italy ... 236
Gallia Cispadana, Transpadana ... 236
Liguria ... 249
Population of Italy ... 252
Sicilia ... 256
Punic towns in Sicily ... 267
Egesta ... 269
Towns of the interior ... 270
Sardinia ... 273
Corsica ... 278
Hispania ... 279
Iberians, Celts, Celtiberians ... 280
Baetica ... 282
The Turdetanians ... 283
The Edetanians ... 291
The Lusitanians ... 297
Celtici, Celtae ... 298
Oretani, Carpetani, Vaccaei ... 298
The Celtiberians ... 299
Callaici, Astures, Cantabri ... 301
Iberians north of the Pyrenees ... 302

PAGE
Gallia 303
Difference between Celts and Germans 305
Difference between the Celts and Belgae 306
The Druids 308
Political division 311
Arverni, Aedui, Sequani 312
Aquitani 313
Armorica 318
Belgae 319
Treviri 319
Germania prima, secunda 320
Britannia 320
Its Population 321
Celtic nations on the east of the Rhine 323
Aravisci, Boii, Norici, Vindelici 323
Taurisci, Scordisci 324
Galatia 325
Bastarnae, Sciri 325

AFRICA.

Cyrenaica 327
Carthaginian Republic 330
Aras Philaenorum 330
The Syrtes 330
Population, language 332
Population of the interior 334
Numidia 339
Aethiopia, Egypt 340
Meroe 241
Some more Greek colonies (in Lydia and Pamphylia) 347
Cyprus 348
Phoenicia 350

A A-e-20

LECTURES
ON
ANCIENT ETHNOGRAPHY AND GEOGRAPHY.

ITALY.

THE name *Italy* was applied at different times to a very different extent of country. The Greeks, who scarcely ever transferred themselves from their own point of view to that of other nations, inform us, that the name *Italia*, beginning in the extreme south, and belonging to a small tract of country, became gradually extended. They relate, that in ancient times the Oenotrians, under this name or without any name, produced the sage Italus, who led them from a state of perfect wildness, or from a life depending on the chase, like that ascribed by the Romans to the Aborigines, to agriculture and fixed habitations, and became their lawgiver. That his laws, resembling those of Minos, were observed for many centuries, and that at first the name Italia was restricted to the southern half of Bruttium, that is, the peninsula between Rhegium and the isthmus, extending from the Scylletian to the Napetinian gulf; that the name was then extended so as to comprise, in about its widest sense, the country south of a line drawn from Posidonia to Metapontum. This whole derivation from the Oenotrian period is without any authority whatever, though it is certain, that in the time of the Persian wars,

and perhaps even somewhat later, that line actually formed the boundary of Italy. Nay, that boundary, instead of extending in the course of a whole century, even became somewhat narrower, and the line, instead of beginning at Posidonia, ran from the river Laos to Metapontum, along the subsequent frontier between Lucania and Bruttium, so that the north-western part of the country was detached from it. This boundary afterwards remained fixed with the Greeks; and the countries north of it were designated by different names, of which I shall speak hereafter. But after the middle of the fifth century of Rome, or about twenty years after the death of Alexander, the name Italia was extended by the Greeks as far as the Tiber. Previously Cumae had not been in Italy, but now even Rome is spoken of as a city of Italy.

This view entertained by the Greeks, though one-sided, is so attractive and seductive, that one easily allows one's self to be captivated by it, especially as we have no detailed account of the natives of Italy to oppose to it. But amid a countless number of particular subjects requiring critical treatment in ancient history, people have forgotten to ask, How did the natives come to use this name? And this question changes our point of view. We have, indeed, no ancient Roman monuments on this subject, but we know for certain, that after the beginning of the seventh century, the name Italy was applied by the Romans to the whole peninsula, as far as Cisalpine Gaul; nay, Polybius extends it even to the foot of the Alps. The name Italy is very ancient, and occurs in the earliest fragments known to us; it is manifestly of native origin, and was habitually used by the Romans in their official language. What then were the limits set to it by the Romans? Did they consider themselves to be living beyond the boundaries of Italy about the middle of the fifth century when the Greeks drew their line of demarcation? If the Samnites and Etruscans were beyond that line, what was the name they applied to the whole of the peninsula? Almost all the coins discovered

on the frontiers of Lucania and Samnium in southern Italy, bear the inscription *Viteliu*; and a statement in Suetonius, a very well read scholar, in his life of Vitellius, mentions *Vitellia* as a divinity worshipped in all Italy. Some of the coins, moreover, have a peculiar figure, a bull with a man's face. The ancients lastly inform us, that *vitulus*, in the ancient Italian language, signified both a calf and a heifer. Accordingly, I recognise in this figure the symbolical representation of a hero and archegetes of the people, who was called by the Greeks Italus, and by the Italian nations Vitellius or Vitalus, and was represented on their coins in a hieroglyphical manner as a bull. This figure of the bull has always been misunderstood; all kinds of symbolical and mythological explanations have been attempted, and a vast deal has been written about Ammon, Bacchus, and the like. All countries derive their names from their inhabitants; Egypt alone, which was thus called by the Ionians from its river (the Odyssey describes it as a *διιπετὴς ποταμός*), forms an exception. This statement is certain, for *Aegyptus* was the original name of the river Nile which is singularly remarkable, and when swollen fills the whole country; so that both have the same name. The name *Egypt* was foreign to the natives as a name of their country; the name with them was *Chemi*, whence the people ought to have been called *Χημοί* or *Χῆμες*. With this single exception, the names of countries are derived from their inhabitants; in Greek geography we always have first the name of the people, and then that of the country. So also *Ἰταλοί* is the original name of the people, and from it is formed *Italia*, the country of the Itali. These Itali comprised a number of tribes of Pelasgian origin, which dwelt there under different names, as Oenotrians, Peucetians, Daunians, Tyrrhenians, Latins, Liburnians, and Siculians, extending on both coasts of the peninsula as far as the Eridanus, though it is uncertain whether in early times they occupied the whole peninsula as far as the frontier of Liguria and the Po, or whether in the south

they possessed all the country, while in the north they dwelt only on the coasts.

If we go back to the earliest accounts, we may assert, that the country south of a line from the coast of Etruria and Latium, from the Liris and Vulturnus up to the ridge which extends beyond mount Vulturnus as far as the heights of mount Garganus, was wholly inhabited by the Italian nation. The nation, however, was not confined within those limits, but also inhabited Latium and Etruria, and extended on the north of mount Garganus as far as the river Po, under the names of Liburnians, Pelasgians, and Siculians. This is the light in which we must view the population of Italy in the earliest times to which we can go back, before those nations were pressed on by a double immigration. For as in other parts, so here also nations were pushing onward from the north, some in a body, and of others only particular branches. Some of the Italian nations were expelled, and others remained in their native places, because the conquerors were not so savage as to be unable to live among them, and preferred having quiet settlements to a wandering life. The nation which gave this great impulse, and unseated (*ἀνέστησαν*) others, was in all probability that of the Etruscans. Farther east, the Illyrians spread themselves from the north, and the Etruscans in Italy proceeded in the same direction. The people, which, in the first instance, penetrated into the country of the Italians, partly expelling and partly subduing them, were the OPICANS. They must be conceived as pressing onward in a broad line, commencing from the banks of the Tiber, so that they took possession of the country of the Aequians, Marsians, Pelignians, northern Samnium, the district of the Frentanians, and western Apulia. At that time they had not yet established themselves either in Campania or in any part of Samnium. Being pressed by the Sabines, they penetrated into the country of the Italians, and overpowered them in all Daunia, so that Daunia became Apulia; and then they advanced

into southern Samnium, Campania, and even into Latium. Italy thus became reduced and confined within those very boundaries mentioned in the earliest Greek traditions, namely, a line from Posidonia to Metapontum. But the Oscan invaders did not long retain these conquests; they maintained one part of them, but lost another. The Sabines were not satisfied with driving them back beyond the ancient frontiers, but pursued them farther, and thus there arose the SABELLIAN nations, that is, the *Samnites* in the widest sense of the term, the *Lucanians*, and, within their boundaries, the *Bruttians*. The same country, therefore, must be regarded at one period as Italian, and at another as Oscan, and again at another as Sabellian. This is the cause of the immense confusion.

The Sabellians were not a numerous nation, and wherever they settled, they appear to have ruled over the subject people rather than to have changed them; the Oscans seem to have acted differently. In the countries which adopted the Opican name, and had formerly belonged to the Italians, the Opican language supplanted the ancient Italian or Siculian tongue; and when the same countries were taken by the Sabellians, the latter were not numerous enough again to change the language, but they themselves adopted that of the Opicans; and hence the language of the Samnites, Lucanians, and others, is called by the Romans Oscan. It is an established fact, that the groundwork of this language was essentially different from the real Sabine. The whole of the Sabine nation stood to the people among whom they had settled, in the same relation in which the Franks stood to the Gauls, or the Lombards to the nations of Italy. The Franks, for a long time, and in fact until the reign of Charlemagne, spoke Frankish, and the name of the country ever after was France, although the language of the people afterwards became Roman; in like manner the Sabellians bore this name, although their language was Oscan. This is the only method of explaining the apparent contradictions in many ancient accounts: the Oscans and Sabellians were

different nations, but their language was the same, the Oscan prevailing everywhere among them. I have for many years laboured to discover how it was possible for the language of the Samnites to be Oscan, seeing that the two nations were essentially, if not altogether, different. Explanations, like that here given by means of comparison with other nations and ages, may be applied to the history of nations as well as to the history of constitutions and laws; a friend of mine, a very ingenious man, has called this "the comparative history of nations," alluding to comparative natural history. Voltaire says, *comparaison n'est pas raison*, but still it often leads to the truth, though it can never supply the place of real proof. But to return to our subject, while the Greeks exclusively apply the name Opicans to the foreign settlers in those parts, and call the country *Opica* or *Ausonia*, because the people called themselves *Auruncans*, the natives adhered to the name Italia, although the Italians had either been expelled or were united and mingled with the conquerors. Within this extent of Italy, then, the ruling Sabellians adopted both for themselves and for the Oscans the name of ITALICANS. Thus, according to the rules of the grammatical logic, which pervades the Latin language, we see *Italia* derived from *Itali*, and from this again the name *Italici*, which without any change might be given to the Italians. Such changes of meaning, however, are of frequent occurrence in the Latin language, for common usage avails itself of such differences, where they exist, for the purpose of adding some modification to the original meaning. It is not till later times, towards the end of the seventh century—the real line of demarcation is formed by the poets of the Augustan age, and by the Augustan age in general—that *Itali homines* and *Itali* are used simply to designate Italians in general: *Italicum genus* and *Italici* were the inhabitants of Italy within the modern kingdom of Naples, exclusive of the Greeks. This is the meaning of the name in Sallust, who wrote in the old Roman fashion.

I have already mentioned to you that the name Italia

was indigenous in the peninsula, and that consequently it was applied to a wider extent of country than was supposed by the Greeks. I have also indicated to you the traces of its history, though not so far back as we are inclined to imagine them to extend. In speaking of the history of Greece, I remarked incidentally, that some events are assigned to dates about two centuries too early. The same is the case in regard to the migrations and conquests of the nations in Italy. About the middle of the fifth century of the city, a decisive change took place in Italy, which had been preparing ever since the time of Dionysius of Syracuse. The Greeks were then more strictly confined to their own territories; and the ancient Italians, who kept up an intercourse with them or were under their dominion, lost their assumed character of Greeks, and became subject to the Sabellian nations, which were known to the Greeks under the general name of Opicans. They bore this name, because there can be no doubt, that the first who conquered a great part of those countries, were for the most part Oscans, who were afterwards obliged to retreat before the Sabellians.

Now, as the whole of the south of Italy, as far as the country of the Marsians, again formed an almost compact Sabellian country (except that in the greater part of Apulia the Sabellians had not made any conquests, but the Opicans maintained their dominion over the ancient Italians), and as the inhabitants of this country called themselves Italicans, it became customary with the Greeks also to call them Italicans, and the southern country Ausonia or Italia—the latter in the language of ordinary life, the former only in poetry;—but the people were rarely or never called Ἰταλοί, nor did the earlier Greeks apply to them the name Ἰταλικοί, but called them Ὀπικοί. This leads me to make a philological observation. It is well known that Juvenal uses the expression *opici mures*, which is commonly rendered in the dictionaries by "old-fashioned," "rude," "stupid," or "barbarous;" but no further explanation is given. The fact is this. The Greeks viewed the Opicans

in a very unfortunate light, as the destroyers of the prosperity of southern Italy, and as men that served as hired mercenaries in the southern armies (e.g. the Mamertines in Sicily); but those who remained at home were by no means contemptible; they appear in a very different light, as the leading men among the Samnites, Lucanians, and others; traits are found among them which inspire great respect, and there are undoubted traces of their having devoted themselves, at an early period, to the study of Greek literature. But those of them with whom the Greeks came most frequently in contact, were people pretty much of the same character as the Thracians and Scythians in the comedies of Aristophanes. The name Opicans was extended by them in a contemptuous sense to all the Italicans, and even to the Romans, as we see from one of the fragments of Cato. The Greeks in general distinguished themselves from all non-Greeks in a harsh and coarse manner; but the designations which they applied to foreigners differ according to the different nations with which they came in contact. The term *βάρβαροι* was originally no doubt applied only to nations of the Carian race, Carians, Lydians, and Mysians; *Ὀπικοί*, in the same sense, to the inhabitants of Italy; and *Κάρβανοι* in the "Supplices" of Aeschylus apparently a Cyrenaic term, seems to have been applied to the Egyptians and Libyans. I do not understand Coptic, nor do I possess any books or dictionary of that language, from which I might derive any information; but I am almost certain that the word *Κάρβανοι* is Coptic, for Aeschylus uses it in speaking of the Egyptians. Its original meaning is unknown to me. We thus see, how the general contrast between Greeks and foreigners presents itself in different shades.

About the time of Pyrrhus, the name Italy, in its whole extent, was applied to the peninsula as far as the frontiers of Etruria and the river Tiber. In this sense the name was used by the Greeks throughout the sixth century, and probably by the Romans also, for both strictly separate the

rest of Italy from Etruria. There is a remarkable passage in Clemens Alexandrinus, who, in his "Stromata," says, "Italy which borders on Etruria." I do not quote Clemens as I would any other ancient Alexandrian author, for he did absolutely nothing but copy from the writers of the sixth century, that is, from those who lived about the time of Aristarchus; and he stops short there, because the authors from whose works he made his compilations, belonged to that period alone. Clemens is generally viewed in too favourable a light; still, however, he contains abundant materials, and no philologer ought to neglect him. When Etruria became more and more Romanised, though there were no Roman colonies in the interior of the country, and when the idea of other states existing in Italy by the side of Rome, vanished, another step was made in advance, and the name Italy was applied to the whole peninsula as far as the foot of the Alps; and in this sense Italy is spoken of by Polybius. Another question cannot, perhaps, be answered; it is this: did he include Liguria under the name of Italy?—did he employ the term Alps in such a manner as to comprise the Ligurian mountains between the coast of Genoa as far as the Po?—or did he extend the boundaries of Italy and Gaul from the Macra as far as the territory of Modena about the Po, then continuing them south of the Po, near Placentia and Parma, beyond the river, so as to make them run west of the Ticinus as far as the mountains? The last is the more probable, as it is the more natural line. In the official language of the Romans, the Rubicon formed the boundary of Italy, so that even Ravenna and the three Legations, which were otherwise not Gallic, were included in Cisalpine Gaul. Augustus was the first to add Cisalpine Gaul to Italy, so as to make the river Varus the frontier towards Gaul, and the town of Pola towards Istria. People may think of Augustus as they please; I do not praise him, nor do I blame him; his arrangements were great, and have exercised an influence upon the history of the world; his divisions of Rome and Italy became permanent. His

division of Italy remained in force for a period of a thousand years, that is, down to the time of the Ottos, the Saxon emperors; and this durability shows that the divisions were based upon a necessary and natural foundation, whence, with the exception of slight changes, they remained during subsequent periods. On the side of Istria, the boundary has become somewhat narrower, in consequence of the change of the population, which in Istria became Slavonian. Under the emperors after Maximinian it became customary to call Lombardy, including Istria, Italy; what was then the name of the southern countries, I know not; hence the Lombard kings call themselves *reges Italiae*, and this Italy is termed by Gregorius Turonensis *parva Italia*.

We shall use the name Italy in the sense in which it is now generally done, excluding Savoy, which, like the French parts of Switzerland and Belgium, belongs to France. The country about the Adige, however, from Roveredo as far as Botzen, ought to be regarded as part of Italy. When you arrive there from Germany by way of Meran, you feel that you are quite in the south, the air and everything else reminds you of it; some of the people indeed speak German, but they are not Germans, and their countenances are ugly; the country, on the other hand, is very beautiful, and in the neighbourhood of Botzen it is like a Paradise. You feel that you are in the south and in Italy, whereas in Savoy you are in France, for it has none of the peculiarities of Italy. If you pay attention to everything, the physiognomy and the dialects, you will be astonished to find how clearly the different tribes of antiquity can still be distinguished. My friend Arndt first directed my attention to this. "When you go to Italy," said he, "notice the difference of the tribes on the borders of Tuscany." That was the boundary between the Etruscans and Ligurians. I was quite surprised still to find among the Tuscans the same fat, round faces, which are seen in ancient works of art. The Etruscans can still be distinguished from

the Umbrians, and the latter again from the Cisalpine Gauls, at least in masses. In Lombardy you may, notwithstanding the strong mixture, still distinguish the dialects, and through them the parts which were inhabited by Gauls from those of the Veneti. It is a mistake to believe that the Italians are very unlike their ancestors; the actual difference arises from the strong admixture of Slavonians, and not from the immigrations, though the Goths were very numerous; but the Lombards were not; the former came with their women and children, and amounted, according to Procopius, to nearly a million of souls.

The three islands which are now considered as parts of Italy, and in which Italian is spoken, do not belong to it, and must be treated of separately.

Italy proper, as defined by Augustus, commenced at the *Alpes Maritimae;* the Alps are then further divided into the Cottian, Graian, Pennine, Raetian, Carnian, and Julian Alps. I shall explain to you each of these names, so as to enable you to find your way among, and to become familiar with, those mountains. From the Alps, then, which form the boundary, the APENNINES branch off in the north of Piedmont in two ranges; on the one side from the two St. Bernards near Aosta and Ivrea, and on the other from the Maritime Alps, and the two uniting in the territory of Montferrat run through Liguria close to the coast, so that in many parts of the territory of Genoa roads for vehicles along the sea have had to be made by blowing up the rocks, and horses often still find it difficult to pass along the sea-coast. They then turn east from the sea into Tuscany, where the mountains, properly speaking, first receive the name of Apennines. Afterwards they spread and extend in a south-eastern direction towards the Adriatic; then proceeding through the middle of the kingdom of Naples they fill, in many, though not parallel ranges, the whole of Lucania and Bruttium; but there the mountains all at once disappear, though in the Abruzzi, where the isthmus separates the southern from the northern country,

they in some parts reach a height of 8,000 feet. For a distance of many miles nothing but small hills are visible. If that country were inhabited by an enterprising people, such as the French or English, the isthmus would long since have been broken through, for nothing would be easier than to make a canal there and to connect the two seas.

The Alps, as is well known, are primary mountains; and their ramifications in the territory of Genoa, which proceed from mount St. Bernard and the Maritime Alps, are of the same character; but the Apennines assume a different nature, and appear throughout Italy as rocks of limestone; in the Majella they may be of a different character, for Alpine productions are found there. In the southernmost part of Italy, facing Sicily, another range of mountains rises of quite a different character, being a continuation of the Sicilian mountains, of which Aetna is the central knot. The country near Rhegium is evidently torn off, as is indicated even by its name.

It is only the middle portion of the western coast of Italy, about a hundred miles from Rome, that is volcanic; the volcanic character always appears south of the Apennines, and prevails in a portion of Latium, as is evident from the soil and the lakes, as e. g., the Alban hills and the Alban lake; the lake of Nemi is a crater. The territory of Campania in its ancient sense (Terra di Lavoro) is of the same character, but it does not extend very far into the interior, for it is visible only in the Phlegraean plains as far as the Liris, and in the country about the gulf of Naples as far as the range of mountains, which terminates between Sorrento and Amalfi; this mountain forms the southern boundary of the volcanic ground. All the rest of Italy is essentially non-volcanic; Lombardy contains indeed a few springs to which one might be inclined to ascribe a volcanic origin, but at any rate only in an improper sense; the coast of the kingdom of Naples on the Adriatic, the whole of Apulia and Iapygia is altogether a limestone country. This stone, in its noblest form, as marble, appears especially in Tuscany

on the frontier of Liguria, where the Apennines begin to form a distinct range; it is there that it appears most perfectly crystallised. In the south-eastern countries, on the other hand, it gradually changes into chalk, and forms natural saltpetre by an *affinité disposée*.

Although Italy is called a unique country, although we think of it as the fair and charming Hesperia, and as the country of oranges described by the poets, still it presents the very greatest variety of climate; the differences are as great, and perhaps even greater than in Germany. We may divide the whole country into three natural parts; we might perhaps make four, but there are in reality only three great divisions. The first may be termed *Greek Italy*, comprising very little more than the country occupied by Greek settlements, that is, the country of the ancient Itali from the neighbourhood of Terracina exclusive of Latium. Imagine a line running from Terracina across the mountains, the Liris and Vulturnus, down to Beneventum, through the valley of the Calor as far as the Garganus: the country south of this line is what I term Greek Italy, because its vegetation and its climate are Greek; the difference between this part and the countries north of it is greater than that existing between the latter and Germany. All the plants and trees which are seen at Rome only here and there, and are kept up with great labour and difficulty, grow there naturally and almost wild, as, for example, the cactus and aloe, which are really southern plants; the pine-tree is rare, and firs scarcely occur at all, while the dwarf-palm already grows between the rocks. Everything not only ripens earlier, as olives and figs, but the fruit is altogether of a different, a southern character; the vegetation is so mighty and gigantic that we in the north can scarcely form an idea of it. At Rome oranges may be destroyed by frost, but in Greek Italy this is impossible; and things which grow at Rome only in favourable years, are there quite common. This is the case with all plants; in short, a man there finds himself in quite a different country. When at Rome I felt as much at home

as a foreigner who has not renounced his own country can possibly feel, and I entered the country free from the prejudices of a native; I visited southern Italy with the physical feeling of a Roman (the Roman climate is still very vividly before my mind), but I had not imagined that every thing could be so different at Terracina. I felt the same when I went from Germany to Italy, though it was then rather the feeling that I was entering a foreign land. The neighbourhood of Terracina is a particularly excellent country. All the wines from the districts of the Liris have a Greek character, whereas those of central Italy stand in the middle between French and Greek wines, and are in reality bad; the sky is of quite a different colour, and the air has something magic and elastic, something elevating and delicious, in comparison with which the atmosphere at Rome is heavy and oppressive. The farther south you go, the more beautiful everything becomes; I never was in the extreme south, but I still hope one day to visit it.. However, I have been assured by travellers who had been there, that the charms constantly increase, the farther south you go; you perceive them even at Formiae, still more in the neighbourhood of Naples, and they appear in a still higher degree at Amalfi; in Calabria nature is said to be quite as delightful as on the south coast of Sicily. The physiognomy and the muscles of men also are different.

The second natural division consists of *central Italy*, which, however, has very different boundaries from those marked in our maps. The southern frontier has already been fixed by what I said before; but the northern runs along the Aesis from the borders of Marca Ancona, the ancient Picenum, across the ridge of the Apennines, so that the sources of the Tiber still belong to central Italy; it then passes along the Apennines on the frontiers of the territory of Bologna to the point where the Apennines unite with the Alps, so that even the coast of Genoa belongs to this part of Italy. This division is likewise based upon the vegetation. Its high mountainous parts have of

course a lower temperature than the valleys, though they are by no means thoroughly different; they belong as parts to the whole, as every whole consists of several and diverse parts. Their character, on the other hand, is quite different from that of the opposite heights, which, under the same degree of latitude, descend into Lombardy. This division, then, with the exception of its highest mountain regions, is the country of the olive-tree, whence the excellent olive plantations in the territories of Lucca and Genoa, and also in Marca Ancona. In the south-western parts of Italy, as, for example, at Naples, the olives are not of equal value, though they are still excellent. The race of men in central Italy has less of the southern character; they still share with the southern people the development of the muscular fibres, though they have it in a less degree; but their features are less harsh, the forms being more round and fleshy; yet these features differ according to the different districts and races.

Northern Italy does not at all follow the parallels of latitude; it commences on the frontiers between the Marca Ancona and the duchy of Urbino, and runs along the northern slope of the Apennines up to the Alps: accordingly it encloses the large basin of the Po, extending beyond the Ticino and Doria, where the boundary line rises up to the heights. This part presents a great difference in temperature and vegetation from the southern countries: the winters are severe, and at the foot of the Alps hard frosts are not uncommon; the olive-tree no longer thrives, but is more like a shrub resembling a crippled willow, and all the southern plants which still occur in central Italy, such as oranges and lemons, are raised only by artificial means and with difficulty as in Germany; the cactus, aloe, and the like, are quite out of the question. The winters are of a northern character and commence early; the atmosphere is heavy and unpleasant, and the whole country has this character more or less. A person coming from the south, e.g. from Florence or Ancona, feels

that he is in a northern country: in the Tyrol and in the Raetian districts, near Trent and Botzen, the climate is far more southerly than there, although in northern Italy the heat in summer is very great; but the cold in winter is equally great, and, in addition to this, the air is generally moist and warm.

These divisions are also traceable in history: northern Italy was the country of the Gauls, and was but gradually incorporated by the Romans with Italy. The Romans not unjustly speak of the *pingue caelum* of those countries; and the Milanese are to this day taunted by the southern Italians with their *aër crassus*. For this reason the inhabitants are on the whole ugly and awkward figures, with the exception of those of Venice, which has a very peculiar and beautiful race of men. The Ligurians also are handsome, the Piedmontese are strikingly fair and almost too delicate, while otherwise the northern Italians have uncommonly coarse skins. The Genoese approach more closely the peculiar Italian race, and the Milanese have vulgar features, and no appearance of refinement and freshness. The Piedmontese, as I have already remarked, show a high degree of refinement, and when, in addition to this, they are blooming, they are most handsome, especially the women; but such a combination is rarely seen, they are generally too fair. The Tuscans are rather a handsome race, with round faces, and the Florentines have even something German in their countenances. The development of the muscles, which we find in southern and to some extent also in central Italy, is wanting in the northern Italians. It has for long time been a matter of doubt, as to whether the ancients studied anatomy; but if a person carefully examines an ordinary Italian model, he will be convinced, that they did not require to study anatomy: the muscles are so perfectly developed, that they can be easily and completely distinguished on a naked arm; the whole play of the muscles can be seen without anatomical operation. This was probably the case to a still greater extent among

the Greeks, but this is not so in the bodies of northern nations; and the muscles of a northern Italian are as much concealed under the skin as they are in our own bodies.

The dialects do not quite coincide with this division; in the north of Italy they vary greatly, although the Genoese and Ligurian predominate.

After this account of the division of Italy into three parts, I shall continue the description of its physical features. I shall first speak of the Alps. To describe them is beyond my powers; if you want to form an idea of them, you must read the excellent description of Strabo; I have seen only those of the Tyrol. The Alps with the ancients are much more extensive than in our maps; not because the nations dwelling near them applied the name to a greater range of mountains; but they are too far distant from us, and we, having a different mode of speaking, are not inclined to apply the name to the same extent of mountains; the whole range, however, forms one mass. The southernmost Alps are those known by the name of *Alpes Maritimae*, which afterwards formed a distinct region in the north of Nice. This city is, properly speaking, situated beyond the natural boundaries of Italy, but strangely enough, belongs to Piedmont, although it is situated beyond the mountains. It is very possible that, if Augustus had not made the Varus the boundary, Nice would now be a town of Provence. The Alps there rise to a mighty height, although they do not belong to the highest; the road from Nice to Coni is a difficult mountain road. It is not quite certain as to whether the ancients had a clear notion of the boundary lines. The Alps, near Briançon, are not distinguished by the ancients by a separate name; the ancient road there ran from the Rhone to Turin; that over Mount Cenis was not made till a later period. These Alps are joined by the *Alpes Cottiae*, where, until the time of Nero, there existed a small Gallic principality under the supremacy of Rome. Next come the *Alpes Graiae* with the two St. Bernards, the great and the little; the latter is the mountain passed by Hannibal, according to

General Melville and De Luc's incontrovertible arguments. This fact ought to be beyond all doubt, and it is insufferable to see the old questions on this point raised again and again. The French army in 1800 crossed the great St. Bernard. The *Alpes Graiae* are said to have received their name from Hercules, who was believed to have crossed them on his expedition into Spain: but the name must have had a different origin. After them follow the *Alpes Penninae*, the Simplon as far as the Furca; the *Alpes Nepontiae*, the St. Gothard, Splügen, etc. After this the names are obscure until we reach the *Alpes Raeticae*, which extend in the Tyrol from Graubündten to the Puster valley. The *Alpes Juliae*, next to these, appear under this name without any reason being assigned for it; but it was no doubt derived from Julius Caesar, to whose province they belonged, but why they were named after him, is unknown. They are also called *Alpes Noricae;* they are the Alps of Carniola, and one branch of them extends into Istria, while another runs round the gulf of the Adriatic into Dalmatia.

The Apennines join the Alps in the country of Piedmont south of the Po; at first their character is indefinite, but soon their own peculiarities and a marked difference from the Alps are developed. In ancient times they were, no doubt, a vast woody range from one end of Italy to the other, whereas the greater part is now barren. In the territory of Genoa, where I have seen them, in the neighbourhood of Florence and in the Romagna, with which I am intimately acquainted, and in fact from the frontiers of Modena and Lucca, they present a very sad aspect, for they are utterly barren, and there is something wild, desolate, and terrific about them. During summer, there is no snow on any of those heights; in May it is often seen, though it is but very little: still, however, the mountains are very high, especially on the frontiers of Florence and Bologna. During winter, storms are of very common occurrence, and no man can find his way through them on account of the snow; the description which Livy gives of the storms in those parts

is certainly not much exaggerated. I have passed those mountains in fair weather, and when I reached the right height, I perceived at once that I was in the region of storms. The passage of Hannibal with his army across that mountain during a snow-storm must certainly have been terrible, nor can we wonder that the Goths of Radagaisus perished there in winter: I think I have found out the district where this happened. Towards Umbria the mountains become considerably lower; they there form a thoroughly beautiful country, the air on the heights is healthy, and chesnut forests again make their appearance. The mountains then run through Umbria in a south-eastern direction across the country of Camarina into the Abruzzi, and their height again increases immensely, so that perpetual snow is said to be found on mount Majella and some others; but this snow must be limited to the ravines. Winter there commences very early; at Rome the top of mount Leonessa is seen covered with snow even at the beginning of November, and frequently continues there till April. This is the highest ridge in Italy, and about it we have to look for the most ancient seats of the Sabines. Thence the mountains extend into Samnium, and one branch runs towards mount Garganus. Farther south, the mountains lose their excessive height, and are again, up to their top, covered with wood, either chesnuts or other trees that are useful to man. The mountains there are comparatively of a moderate size, and are exposed to the full influence of a southern climate, especially in Lucania, and in their continuation extend into Bruttium down to the peninsula which physically belongs to Sicily. The last extremity, which ought no longer to be called Apennines, for it neither belongs to them in a geological point of view, nor do the mountains run in the same direction—I allude to the mountain between Lucania and the isthmus—is the Sila, the large Bruttian range of mountains covered with fir forests, where the Romans had their large establishments for

the manufacture of tar, and whence they derived their timber for ship-building.

These general remarks about the mountains may suffice for the present: I shall enter more into detail, as occasions occur, and now pass on to the rivers.

The PADUS, the *fluviorum rex Eridanus*, has none of the characteristics of a southern river; it has the same natural features as the Waal and the Leck in the Netherlands, for it is muddy, and as it has been so long shut in between embankments, its bed is so high, that the surface of its waters is from fifteen to twenty feet above the level of the surrounding country. The whole basin of the Po, and of the rivers emptying themselves into it, was originally a vast bay of the sea, which was gradually confined to these rivers; it is a "river-marsh," as the people in Dithmarsh would say. How many thousands of years may this process have lasted! At the time when the mouth of the Po was far above the point where it now is, a succession of downs had been formed from the neighbourhood of Rimini as far as the innermost corner of the Adriatic, or as far as Aquileia and Trieste, just as in the Kurische and Frische Nehrung in Prussia, and as was formerly the case along the coast from Calais to Jutland. Behind these downs there was a vast inland lagune which became gradually filled up; in the neighbourhood of Venice the filling up is prevented only by artificial means. These hillocks of sand are now called *lido;* such a one exists near Venice, and upon it depends the safety of the city during high floods. Ravenna was in antiquity a city like Venice, built upon islands and stakes; but the space gained in the course of 2000 years scarcely amounts to eight miles. All the rivers descending from the Apennines on the south of the Po empty themselves into it, and all those which flow from the north on the east of the lake of Garda discharge their waters into the lagunes: they all have their share in extending the coast. The most important of these rivers will be mentioned,

when I come to speak of the countries to which they belong.

In central Italy, the TIBER is the king of rivers. The orthography *Thybris* must be ancient, as it was also adopted by the Greek writers. The Tiber is indeed the most renowned river in the world, but it is by no means beautiful; its waters are very muddy and rapid and of a disagreeable appearance; navigation is difficult, and consequently not frequent, and the country about the river is much exposed to inundation. There can scarcely be a more unpleasing sight than that of the Tiber at Rome. Its tributaries are the *Anio* (now *Teverone*, even in antiquity called *Tiburnus*), the *Nera* or *Nar* (a Sabine word signifying sulphur, which is contained in its waters), and a number of small streams without particular names; it also receives supplies of water from lake Velinus.

The ARNO is the principal river of Tuscany; it is smaller but incomparably more beautiful than the Tiber, especially in the neigbourhood of Florence. I think I have first discovered its extremely remarkable history, partly by my own observations, and partly from the excellent chronicle of Florence. It originally consisted of three distinct rivers. At its mouth the sea formed an estuary, and as the water of those marshes was carried into the sea by a small river in the neighbourhood of Pisa, the inhabitants considerably widened it by making drains through the marshes, and thus carrying the waters into the river. The middle part was a large lake covering the ground now occupied by Florence: the rock Gonfalina formed a barrier against it, but being cut through, an outlet was formed towards the lower Anio, as has been observed even by Villani. The large ancient basin of this lake may still be recognised, and the walls of Fiesole still show how high it was.[1] The third part, now the upper Arno, was formed in the ante-Roman period in the neighbourhood of La'ncisa, likewise by cutting a canal through a rock for the purpose of

[1] *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 130.

making an outlet for the water which formerly flowed partly towards the Tiber, and partly formed another lake. In this manner, the most excellent country, with the most wonderful natural beauties, has been almost entirely recovered by human ingenuity.

The LIRIS, on the frontier between central and southern Italy, is mentioned under the name of the *Garigliano* as early as the ninth century. It flows down from the Apennines as a beautiful mountain-torrent in the neighbourhood of Arpinum and Sora, but near its mouth it deserves the name of *quietus amnis*, at least under ordinary circumstances; for during the changes of the seasons, its current is often very strong.

The VULTURNUS was no doubt so called from an ancient Oscan or Samnite word *vultur*, signifying a mountain. The east-wind which is known at Rome under the name of *Vulturnus*, probably also derives its name from a Samnite mountain, for it has no reference to the river.

The other rivers in the west, which discharge their waters into the Tyrrhenian sea, are insignificant. I may, however, mention the *Silarus*, which forms the northern, and the *Laus*, which forms the southern boundary of Lucania.

The AUFIDUS, now Ofanto, is the only large river in southern Italy, which empties itself into the Adriatic; it is still, when swollen, very rapid and raging, as it is described by Horace. Its fall is greatest near the Apennines; it is not a fine river, and its waters are muddy with lime.

The seas surrounding Italy are: in the west, the *mare inferum*, *Τυρσηνικὴ θάλασσα*, extending from the Ligurian gulf to Sicily; it is called *mare Tyrrhenicum* or *Tuscum* only by Roman poets and by those who affect to write learnedly. The Romans certainly did not call the Adriatic *mare Hadriaticum*, but *mare superum*; the Greeks sometimes call it *Ἰόνιος κόλπος*. The sea in the south-east of Italy had no special name among the Romans, but the Greeks call it *Ἰόνιος θάλασσα*.

The bays of Tarentum and Liguria are sufficiently described by their names.

Let us now proceed to the divisions of Italy. I shall first speak of the most ancient ones, which arose with and through the nations themselves. They are very variable, and I am afraid it will not be possible to make their relations quite clear without being very minute.

In the earliest times, Italy may be conceived somewhat in the following manner: southern Italy, from the line I have already mentioned as running from mount Garganus across the country as far as the coast of Latium, is the country of the Itali, who appear there as different tribes and under different names. To the north of that line we have the country of the Opicans, next that of the Sabellians, and to the north of them we have the Umbrians; it is possible, that at the same early period the Etruscans, who had come from the north, may have dwelt there, while the whole coast on both sides, from Pisa as far as the Adriatic gulf, was occupied by Pelasgian tribes. This form of Italy is the most ancient of which we have any knowledge; we have nothing more definite during the historical ages. In passing on to the time which we call the end of regal power, or the beginning of the consulship, we find in the south the Greek settlements scattered in an almost unbroken line from Tarentum to Posidonia, in Apulia and Calabria, while Neapolis and Cumae occur in Campania. The Oenotrian tribes are partly allied with, and partly dependent on, those Greek colonies. The Oscans at that time probably extended into Calabria, and occupied Apulia, Samnium, and Campania; the Volscians and Aequians belonged to them. Whether these Oscan tribes were in any way akin to the Pelasgians; is a question which it is difficult to answer, though it is clear, that afterwards they became mixed and amalgamated with them; for in Latium, for example, Oscans and Pelasgians lived together. Next to them follow the Sabellian tribes from the frontiers of Apulia, viz., the Picentians, Pelignians, Marrucin-

ians, Vestinians, Marsians, Frentanians, Sabines, etc., and they extend down to Rome. The country north of them was occupied by the Umbrians, inhabiting an extensive territory, though they were already a declining people, having been broken by the Etruscans. These Etruscans were then already in full possession of the country as far as the neighbourhood of Rome, and on the other side they extended to the very summits of the Alps in Raetia, and the Alpine tribes in the district of Graubündten belonged to them: they were a great and mighty nation, occupying the whole of the north of Italy. The north-east was inhabited by the Veneti, and in the north-west the Ligurians extended as far as the Ticinus. But then the Gauls invaded Italy, crushed some of the Ligurian tribes, overpowered and annihilated the Etruscans on the Po, with the exception of a few places, such as Mantua and Verona; they even advanced into Picenum, and ruled over many tribes which were not expelled by them. All those who were able to offer resistance remained, but all the others were extirpated; wherever the Gauls appeared, they changed the country which they did not occupy for themselves into a wilderness, and forests arose where formerly agriculture had been flourishing. Hence, when subsequently the Romans extended their dominion in those parts, they found the country a desert, and as such it is described even by Polybius.

I shall not here enter into a description of the condition of Italy, which was the result of the Roman conquest, for I should have to repeat the same afterwards in giving you an account of the separate countries: even a general outline would render it necessary to enter into great detail. We shall at once pass on to the seventh century, as the period of regular organisation, when the Sempronian laws completely fixed the boundaries of Italy. Italy then extended as far as Ariminum, and on the other side as far as the river Macra. The country north of those points was in ordinary life called *Gallia Cispadana*, but it did not form a province by

itself, in the sense of a country regularly governed by propraetors or proconsuls. Before the time of Augustus, and even during the first years of his reign, Gallia Transpadana and Venetia were not included in Italy, but were under a military administration, sometimes united with Illyricum and sometimes with Gaul in the wider sense of the name. Augustus first joined that country politically to Italy, as it had long since become Latinised by the extraordinary influx of Romans from Latium. This is quite surprising. The use of the Latin language seems to have become universal with extraordinary rapidity, and sometimes even in the short space of a single generation. It is remarkable how quickly such a change takes place, while afterwards there occurred a stand-still, and no further extension took place. In France the Latin language had spread so rapidly in consequence of the Roman conquest, that, even at the time when Pliny wrote, it generally prevailed in Provence as far as Lyons, and the Gallic language had disappeared. From Sulpicius Severus and the ecclesiastical fathers, we see that in the fifth century the Romanic was the vernacular tongue in Gaul and not Celtic. This was the case from Provence to Armorica, and during the period of the Frankish kings the boundaries of the Romanic language were undoubtedly the same as they are at present, and for centuries the language of Lower Britanny has not lost a single village. I do not mean to say, that the Celtic was everywhere else quite extinct, but it was spoken very little, just as in some villages of Lusatia, Wendish is spoken, of which the inhabitants of the towns do not understand a word. Augustus, then, extended Italy in this manner, because the northern parts had either already become Latinised, or showed every symptom of soon becoming so.

Augustus divided Italy into eleven regions, and afterwards, in the third century of our era, probably under Severus, this number was increased to fifteen. Pliny has made the former the basis of his description, but the latter is not

found quite complete in any ancient author. A knowledge of these divisions is of great importance in history, in order to understand the notices of ancient writers, especially of the "Scriptores Historiae Augustae."

The regions of Augustus are:—1. *Latium* and *Campania*, from the Tiber to the Silarus, on the frontier of Lucania. 2. *Southern Samnium*, *Beneventum*, the country of the *Hirpini*, *Apulia* and *Calabria*. 3. *Lucania* and *Bruttium*. 4. *Northern Samnium* and the country of the *Marsians*, *Marrucinians*, *Pelignians*, and *Vestinians*. 5. *Picenum*. 6. *Umbria*. 7. *Etruria*, a name which remained customary until the second century; but from that time and especially during the third century, it was always called *Tuscia*, as *Tusci* was always the name of the inhabitants. Tuscia occurs neither in Cicero, nor in Livy, nor in Ennius, nor in Cato. But in the reign of Constantine no scholar ought to speak of Etruria. These are things which serve as hints to him who understands them to indicate the time at which anything is written, and which are stumbling blocks to those who are ignorant of them. When at Rome, I had made such progress in these matters, that in looking at a ruin, I could immediately discern to what century it belonged, and in like manner a practised eye can, even without any statement of time or place, discover whether coins are Thracian or Cilician and whether they belong to the period before or after Alexander. Historical blunders are quite as bad as grammatical ones; they are not indeed illogical, but they grate upon well-trained ears and feelings, and create uneasiness. 8. *Ariminum*, the legations of Urbino, Ferrara, and Romagna. 9. *Liguria*, the country south of the river Po, from the borders of Etruria as far as the Alps. 10. *Venetia*, and 11. *Regio transpadana*, from the Lago di Garda to the Alps.

If we were to understand the later division into provinces according to this scheme, we should misplace Liguria, for example, entirely, for that country contained nothing of what had previously been comprised under the same name. This

later division, as I said before, was made in the third century, probably in the reign of Severus. Paulus Diaconus furnishes the best ground-work of this division, although he is very confused, not enumerating the regions in any definite order. The fifteen regions, according to his statement, are: —1. *Venetia et Histria*, as far as the Benacus or Lago di Garda. 2. *Liguria*, the same country which was formerly called Transpadana, from the Lago di Garda to the foot of the Swiss Alps near mount St. Bernard; it was, therefore, on the north of the Po, and only a small corner of it belonged to ancient Liguria. In this sense we find the name used in the Codex Theodosianus and in Procopius. Two *limites* above Italy were then regarded as parts of Italy, which in the time of Augustus did not yet belong to it, viz., 3. *Raetia prima*, and 4. *Raetia secunda*; but their boundaries are not mentioned anywhere. 5. *Alpis Cottia*, or *Alpes Cottiae*, the ancient Liguria proper as far as the frontiers of Tuscia; the name is transferred from the Cottian Alps in the neighbourhood of mount Cenis and Susa to the whole of ancient Liguria. 6. *Tuscia et Umbria* (in the official style, for otherwise people then wrote Thuscia). Thuscia is Tuscany, and the part of Umbria, which was then called Umbria in a narrower sense, embraced Assisi, Spello, Foligno, etc. 7. *Campania Aurelia.* Campania comprises the whole region which Augustus called *Latium et Campania*, extending from the Tiber to the Silarus. Hence the modern name of *Campagna di Roma*, of which traces occur even in the writers of the western empire, as in the expressions, *Campania Romana*, *Campania Romae;* in Servius we read: *Gabii quondam oppidum Campaniae*, but this passage occurs in one of those books (from the end of the fourth to the beginning of the twelfth), of which it can be proved, that their present form belongs to a much later time; the substance was composed in the fourth century, but the form probably arose in the eighth century in the grammatical school of Ravenna.

One hundred miles around Rome, the *provinciae subur-*

bicariae, must be distinguished from Thuscia and Campania; they did not belong to the regions, but were under the praefectus urbi, whence *Thuscia suburbicaria*, subsequently the *Patrimonium D. Petri*, and *Campania suburbicaria* were opposed to *Campania Aurelia*, that is, the Campagna di Lavoro. The name *Aurelia* has not been understood by the few scholars who have treated of this period; and wherever the name was found, the strangest emendations have been attempted, because it was believed that it was not the name of a province; but express testimony that it was a province occurs in Boëthius and others. 8. *Lucania et Brittia.* We must adhere to this corrupt ancient mode of spelling *Brittia*, for so it occurs in MSS., in subscriptions, in the "Scriptores rei Agrariae," in the "Notitia imperii" and elsewhere.

Our guide now passes on to the Alpes Penninae. Wallis must, probably, be regarded as a region, and also Aosta and Ivrea under the name of 9. *Alpes Penninae;* Paulus Diaconus, however, calls them *Apenninae*, and applies the name to some country of central Italy; but it can be proved that such a province never existed. 10. *Aemilia*, between a part of the Alpes Cottiae and Liguria, from Piacenza to Bologna. 11. *Flaminia*, that is, Romagna, Ferrara, Pesaro, or the maritime district as far as the Marca Ancona. 12. *Picenus* (masculine, supply *ager*), the Marca Ancona with some adjoining Sabellian districts. 13. *Valeria*, extending from Tibur over the country of the Marsians, Pelignians, and perhaps, also, the Marrucinians; this province is sometimes politically united with Picenus, for Alba, the capital of Valeria, is also called, in the imperial rescripts, *Alba in Piceno.* 14. *Samnium*, and 15. *Apulia et Calabria.* Then come the islands Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

These provinces must be remembered in order to understand the history; if a person does not know them, he cannot understand the new and differently used names in Procopius and others. The names Aemilia, Valeria, Flaminia, and Aurelia, were taken from the roads which bore them; Flaminia is the district which Augustus had left

without a name, perhaps the *regio Ariminensis*. The Via Flaminia ran from Rome to Ariminum, and was thence continued under the same name; and Scaurus afterwards continued it as far as Piacenza under the name Aemilia. The Via Valeria led into the interior; its originator is unknown, but it was perhaps Messalla, for in the elegy of Tibullus on him, he is praised for having made roads; earlier writers do not mention this road. Connected with this subject is one of the most pleasing recollections of my life: I had just been reading that elegy, when I was informed that a cross-road had been discovered, unquestionably the same which is described by Tibullus; the part of it which is laid open is preserved as beautifully, as if it had been completed only this year. It is a road running through the midst of Tivoli, and its pavement is so perfectly preserved that the stones have scarcely removed the breadth of a knife's back from one another; the Romans built for eternity, and succeeded where the destructive hands of barbarians did not interfere. The Aurelia must likewise have been a road, though not a very ancient one, but probably made by M. Aurelius, or else the name of the Via Domitiana was changed, in order to obliterate the hateful recollection. Domitian raised splendid structures, but the hatred with which he was looked upon, transferred many of them to others, as his Forum was transferred to Nerva.

If we arrange the before-mentioned fifteen provinces, we first have, in the north of the territory of Rome, *Thuscia*, in the south *Aurelia*, and between them *Valeria*; on the other side, beginning in the south, we have *Lucania et Brittia*, *Samnium*, *Picenus*, and behind Samnium *Apulia et Calabria;* in the north, *Flaminia*, *Aemilia*; then from the sea-coast the *Alpis Cottia*, including Genoa and Piedmont, *Liguria*, *Alpes Penninae*, *Venetia et Istria*, and beyond Italy the two *Raetiae*.

The Codex Theodosianus contains an expression which is so peculiar, that even the great Jacobus Gothofredus mistook it; we there read that some laws were promulgated

per Italiam et Alpes. *Italia* here does not denote the whole peninsula, but only Lombardy, while *Alpes* signifies the Cottian and Pennine Alps and the two Raetiae.

We shall now take up Italy according to its various countries, beginning with

LATIUM,

the heart of Italy. I do not mean to say that Samnium might not equally well have become the heart of the country, but history has willed it otherwise. Latium is by its situation destined to exercise the sovereignty, while that of Samnium is less favourable in this respect. The name Latium was not always applied to the same extent of country; the Greek name is ἡ *Λατίνη*, whereas τὸ *Λάτιον* is a later form copied from the Latin, and properly signifies *jus Latii*, in which sense it is used, for example, by Appian, who was a jurist. Latium received its name from the people of the Lati or Latini; but in what sense the name was given to the people, remains at least a controverted question.

I cannot, in these Lectures, always attempt to prove to you the correctness of my views, and I have done so only in a few instances; but where, owing to the multiplicity of the traditions, no definite conclusion has been come to, or where I have not been able to arrive at a settled conviction, I state to you what can be said for and against it. What I am now going to state is my well-weighed conviction, and not the result of an inquiry made to-day or yesterday. I commenced studying the subject at a very early age, about thirty-five years ago; afterwards I put it on one side for many years, because I was engaged in others, and those the most practical occupations, in financial, commercial, and exchange matters,—years which I do not regret, for I think that in them I did some service to my contemporaries. But I

never lost sight of my favourite inquiries, for I cherished them in my walks, in my travels, nay, in the midst of the confusion of war. One of the most important inquiries, viz., that about the Slavonians and Sarmatians, I made in the interior of Russia, when I had no books with me except a Latin translation of Strabo. With this conviction I will at once lay before you the results of my investigations; it would take several years, if I were to attempt to refute the opinions of others: I shall give you that which I honestly hold to be true and correct.

The extent of Latium was different at different times. In the earliest ages, it cannot have been confined between the Tiber and the Liris, but must have extended far beyond the Liris, perhaps as far as Cumae and the frontiers of Italia in its narrowest sense. Such it appears in the treaty between Rome and Carthage; this is evident from the words in Polybius, where it is stipulated, that the Carthaginians should make no conquests on the coast from Ostia to Terracina, which was subject to the Romans. Latium therefore must have extended farther south; I will not absolutely assert, that in the north also it extended beyond the Tiber. As afterwards the whole of the sea coast was taken possession of by the Volscians, the coast for a time did not belong to Latium, and even Antium must have been separated from it. But Latium, in a narrower sense, is the country of the thirty allied towns forming the Latin state during the first period of the Roman republic, when the sea coast was separated from it. This continued to be the extent of Latium until the end of the fourth century of the city, when the maritime towns again united with Latium and formed the great Latin league, which I have described in the first edition of my history, and which, as I have only now discovered, was formed in the year 397. Latium then extended as far as the Liris, but not beyond it, for in the south of this river we find Campania, which during the earliest times is never mentioned. During this period therefore, the Volscians and Auruncans on the coast are

likewise called Latins. This meaning of the name afterwards changed again, and only a portion of that country together with all the Latin colonies was termed *nomen Latinum*, that is *gens Latina*, or *genus Latinum*, just as we have *nomen Romanum*, *nomen Fabium* in Livy. The Latin colonies consisted of Romans, Latins, and Italicans; they became a single nation, which the Romans planted all over Italy, and they rose to such importance as almost to throw the ancient Latin towns into oblivion, so that at the time of the Hannibalian war the name Latini signified the Latin colonies and the few Latin towns which had belonged to the ancient confederacy and had not yet obtained the Roman franchise. Their number continued to increase until the lex Julia, which conferred the Roman franchise upon all of them; Tibur and Praeneste also, the only remaining towns of the old Latin confederacy, now received the franchise, and for the moment the Latini ceased to exist. However, at Rome any gaps which arose, were immediately filled up; when one generation became effete, another of new and vigorous citizens was established in its place. C. Pompeius Strabo afterwards conferred the *jus Latii* upon the towns of Gallia Transpadana, and with this wise and progressive measure introduced something quite different from what had been customary before. These new Latins were levied for the Roman legions, whereas the earlier ones had formed cohorts of their own; the latter had been in the relation of isopolity, and by virtue of the *jus municipii* they might take the Roman franchise whenever they pleased; but the new Latins in Gallia Transpadana could do this only when they had held a municipal office in any of their own towns. They, moreover, had no *connubium*: when a Roman married such a Latin woman, his children were not Roman citizens. Sigonius is intolerable on this subject, and so also most of the moderns. It is sad that our jurists are not better philologers; I think that in questions of this kind an intimate acquaintance with the ancient authors is indispensable. But on the other hand,

philologers ought to possess a very accurate knowledge of Roman law.

This creation of Pompeius Strabo naturally produced two off-shoots. In the first place, some people *extra Italiam positi* now likewise obtained the *jus Latii*, especially certain Spanish tribes and the inhabitants of Provence, and all of them on the same footing as the Galli Transpadani. You ought to know these rights of the Transpadani, because they belong to the age of Cicero and Caesar, and are of interest in the history of that period. Secondly, in the reign of Tiberius there was passed the *Lex Junia Norbani*[1], which limited the manumission of slaves, and provided regulations to effect a state of security for freedmen without their obtaining the franchise. This is the later *Latinitas*, mentioned in the law-books. The *lex Aelia Sentia* had already established similar limitations, to prevent slaves from becoming Roman citizens by manumission; but these restrictions consisted in the formalities of the law, which had grown obsolete, and were, in many instances, troublesome and even injurious. The law had thus become unsettled. Formerly the earlier Latins were not distinguished from the later ones; but the ancient Latins had the *connubium*; all the Italians, in fact, had it, and most certainly the Latins.

Being a part of larger nations, the Latins bore the names of these nations; hence they were called Tyrrhenians by Greek authors; but even their own names had different forms, for they are called *Lavini* and no doubt also *Lacini*. The ancient national name Lavini gave rise to the story that Latinus had a brother Lavinus, and that the latter gave the name to the town of Lavinium—a statement which was adopted by those who would not derive the name of the

[1] "Not *Junia Norbana*. Laws with two qualifying adjectives always had two authors, but our law originated with L. Junius Norbanus." According to a more recent view, the Norbani belonged to the Vibii, and the name *Junia* in our law is derived from M. Junius Silanus, who was consul in A.D. 19.—ED.

town from Lavinia. This view of the matter at once explains that which puzzled the grammarians, and which our wretched epitomes of the commentaries on the Aeneid cannot solve. Namely, Virgil often speaks of *litora Lavina* and *arva Lavinia* before the arrival of Aeneas in Italy, because he entertained the notion that the name *Latini* arose afterwards from the union of the Trojans and Aborigines; hence he took the poetical form *Lavinus*. In like manner, Virgil, in his catalogue, at the end of the seventh book, when speaking of the tribes of Latium, says *picti scuta Lavici*, which has always been referred to the town of Lavici in Latium, which was called after its inhabitants; but we cannot take this as the name of a town, as both before and after tribes only are mentioned, and *Lavici* there is nothing else than Latini. There can be no doubt that they were also called *Lacini*. King Latinus is in some traditions called Lacinus, and under this name he was transferred to southern Italy. This is one of the points which are not sufficiently attended to in the grammatical study of the Latin language. It is indeed very difficult to speak of these matters, as we have so few authentic remains of the ancient Latin dialects, and even the very name "Latin dialects" sounds strange to us, for they are mentioned only by the most ancient among the Latin grammarians. We find it stated, for example, that the Praenestines had a peculiar pronunciation. There can be no doubt that the Latins had their different dialects, though the differences were not so strongly marked as in Greek. The Oscan and several dialects to which the Oscan approached more or less, were kindred languages of the Latin. I hope that more light may be thrown upon this subject, especially by means of inscriptions; several have already been discovered, which I have succeeded in explaining; some exist at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and still more will no doubt be discovered. The Oscan is a language which stands to the Latin in nearly the same relation as that in which

the Cretan (which we know, e. g., from inscriptions of Hierapytna) stands to the Ionic dialect.

Besides these names of the Latins, I will mention a few others, and first that of *Aborigines*. It is inconceivable that this name should ever have been borne by the Latin nation itself, for it is nothing else but the designation of a primitive people. The ancients generally explain it to mean a nation from which others are descended; but this etymology can scarcely be correct, it is probably synonymous with the Greek αὐτόχθονες, for under this name and in this sense they are actually mentioned in Roman traditions. We must bear in mind that all traditions agree in representing the Latins as a mixed race: in the Trojan legends they consist of Trojans and Aborigines, that is, strangers who arrived by sea, and natives. But these legends do not belong to the history of nations; they are mere fictions, which arose out of the Tyrrhenian origin of the Latins. According to the other legend, which has more of the character of an historical tradition, the Latin nation arose out of an immigrating people, which, descending from the mountains, subdued the *Siculi* (only a dialectic variety of *Itali*), the ancient inhabitants who extended into the interior as far as Tibur. This immigrating people had no name, or we must suppose that its name or names have disappeared from the traditions. But they were called *Casci* (which, according to Saufeius in Servius, was the name of the Aborigines) or *Prisci*. In a later and more detailed account of the history, this relation is completely reversed, the immigrating mountaineers being called Aborigines. This is evidently wrong, for those are not autochthons who subdue others, but those who are subdued: thus the natives of Attica are called autochthons by the conquering Ionians. The name *Prisci* is an original national name, though it is not mentioned by the ancients: *Priscus*, like *Cascus*, became a common appellative in the sense of "old" in the same way as we call a thing Gothic

or Old-Frankish; but this is only a later meaning. The name by which the Latins are mentioned in the early history of Rome and in the formulae of the pontifical books, is *Prisci Latini.* This has been translated "the ancient Latins" as opposed to the *colonarii Latini;* but this is quite impossible, for they bore that name at a time when no Latin colonies were in existence. *Prisci Latini* is a combination of two national names just like *populus Romanus Quirites*, *Patres Conscripti,* and the legal expressions *empti venditi*, *locati conducti*, and signifies "the nation of the Prisci and Latini." Two words denoting either closely allied, or totally opposed objects, the two extremes or poles of one idea, are put in juxtaposition without any connecting link; this was the practice wherever one whole was to be expressed by two terms. In this respect also much is still to be done for Latin grammar; some things have been treated of with great diffuseness, which might be settled in a few words, while others have been completely neglected. Even in declension entire forms have been misunderstood, but it is especially in regard to syntax that very much remains to be done. The ancient mode of speaking occurs now and then, and is either overlooked altogether or treated as exceptional; but it ought to be treated with the same accuracy as, for example, the epic dialect in Greek. In our case, e. g., the grammatical observation throws light upon history; the Prisci Latini are the people of the thirty towns, consisting of Priscans and Latins. The Priscans are the Oscan conquerors, and the Latins the inhabitants of the coast, or the ancient Tyrrhenian population. As in the genealogies of the Greeks, the Pelasgian race is not separated, whence the heroes of the Trojan time frequently belong to the Pelasgian genealogies, so the heroes of the Oscans also occur among the Latins, and vice versa. Hesiod, in the well-known passage, mentions Latinus, the son of Circe and Odysseus, as ruler of all the Tyrrhenians (*Πᾶσι Τυρσηνοῖσιν ἀγακλειτοῖσιν ἀνάσσων*), understanding by

Tyrrhenians the people dwelling on the coasts, in the wide extent of ἡ Λατίνη.

These are the results of my investigations about the Latins. They are spoken of in two senses: in the most ancient, they comprise all the Siculians or Tyrrhenians on the western coast of Italy; in a narrower and later sense, the Latins are a mixed people of Siculians and the Oscans who had come down from the mountains. The great mass of the real Latins became so amalgamated with the conquerors, that the main body remained essentially Pelasgian; the alleged emigration[1] either does not refer to the Latins at all, or only to a small portion of them; they remained after the foreign conquest in such numbers, that their race did not undergo any change, in the same manner as the Italians, after the Lombard conquest, remained essentially Italians, although the Lombards, who had come with their women and children were the rulers. Even a small people may preserve its peculiar language for a long time; the Franks perhaps had scarcely twenty thousand soldiers. Sismondi, whose judgment is otherwise in most matters of little weight, here observes quite correctly, that in the tenth century, the Dukes of Beneventum still had Lombard names; thus one is called Store Seitz, "preparing seats;"[2] and this was four centuries after the immigration of the Lombards. In like manner, the nobles in Livonia speak Lettish, but among themselves they speak German with a peculiar pronunciation; several of them live on their estates, speak German and have German chaplains, being, among thousands of Livonians, the only Germans. And yet more than five centuries have already elapsed since they settled there.

In describing the physical condition of Latium, I shall use the name in the sense in which we find it, for example,

[1] *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 81, foll.

[2] Sismondi, *Hist. des Republ. Italiennes*, i. p. 249; but he explains the name to mean *la grande côte*; it moreover belongs to the ninth century as a surname of Grimoald II.—Ed.

in Pliny, where it signifies the country between the Tiber, the Liris, and the Anio, though on the side of the Anio the frontier must not be taken too strictly. In our maps the boundary line is marked along the Anio; but this is incorrect, for not only Tibur is situated on its right bank, but also Nomentum, Corniculum, and other places. Latium, in a physical point of view, consists of three distinct parts. The first is of a volcanic nature, and its central point is the Mons Albanus (Monte Cavo), with which are connected the hills of Tusculum. This volcanic part extends from the Campagna di Roma as far as Velitrae, so that the country, as it approaches the Tiber and the sea, terminates in low hills and almost forms a plain. This part is at present called the Latin Hills (Monti Latini); the ancients have no corresponding name for it, though it is quite isolated. The second part is on the east of the first, and consists of a continuation of the Apennines, which runs across the Anio as far as the Liris; in front of it are the hills of the Hernicans, which are likewise essentially a part of the Apennines, for they consist of limestone and have no traces of a volcanic nature; they extend as far as the borders of the Pontine marshes. Between them and the neighbourhood of Tivoli, the country is low, and in some parts a perfect plain, as in the district where Gabii was situated; but although the country is level, it still shows traces of volcanic agency. This is the country of the Hernicans, with lofty Praeneste and the Latin colonies on the border of the Pontine marshes; further on, as far as the hills, the country contained the Aequian and Volscian towns. Those hills are extremely beautiful, and the high country of mount Algidus lies between them and the volcanic plain of Campania; the district of mount Algidus forms the watershed, the waters on the one side flowing towards the Liris, and on the other towards the Anio and the sea through the Pontine marshes. On the north-east of Velitrae there is a table-land with broken ground. The third part, or the country in the north-west, the west, and south, is of quite a different

character, consisting of loose, volcanic ground, puzzolano and tufo, which are products of volcanic eruptions. The Tiber in the neighbourhood of Rome was once an arm of the sea, as is clear from the undoubted investigations of Brocchi, and pure marine sand is found there; but in whatever part of the country a mineral occurs, it always consists of an immense quantity of puzzolano, which in some parts has become tufo. Such is the nature of all the country round Rome, but strange to say, one part of the Aventine contains a vein of limestone. Towards the sea the nature of the country is, I believe, the same. On the coast, the land sinks down and becomes a plain of sand as in many barren districts of Germany, whence the coast is covered with firs, and was called *ager macerrimus* by Fabius Maximus.[1] South of Ostia the coast gradually rises and becomes a down connecting Latium with cape Circaeum, the high promontory of Circe. This hill belongs to the Apennines, and it is impossible to say how it may have become attached to Latium; it must, however, originally have been separated from it by an inland sea. Into this sea behind the downs, the river Ufens and several others poured their waters from the hills; and the mud carried down by them has formed the Pontine marshes, the nature of which was distinctly recognised even by the ancients as a *πρόσχωσις*, that is, a filling up of a place which was once a part of the sea, but they were mistaken as to the period when this happened. Lessing justly observes that many an error consists in merely mistaking the time; I know from my own experience, that even when you entertain a sound and correct view of a thing, you may often err in regard to time: you are anxious at once to fix the time, and commit a blunder. Such is the case also in ancient history. Pliny is one of those men who, by immense industry, have made themselves dull; he is originally not deficient in intelligence and judgment. Many people carry reading and writing to excess; Heyne, for example, would have become a good philologer, had he not

[1] *Hist. of Rome*, i. p. 194, note 560.

undertaken too much, and had he not thereby been obliged to cut many a knotty point instead of solving it. It is possible, therefore, that his name will not be remembered by posterity. In some chapters Pliny does not show his usual manner; many things are treated of with a real love of his subject and with great success, and his history may even have been beautiful and genial. But he thought he was able to produce a work, the extent of which, as he fixed it in his own mind, was beyond the grasp of man, unless he had given up everything else in order to be able to complete it. He dictated, and had a person to read to him even when he was taking his bath or his meals, and by this means all kinds of materials were accumulated without discrimination. It is possible that he may have passed the Pontine marshes a hundred times; but Mucianus had recorded the erroneous opinion, that at one time twenty-three towns had existed there, and Pliny copied it; he states however, in the same breath, that a lake had covered the same country as late as the time of Theophrastus. The latter indeed speaks of islands, but had not seen them himself. The marshes can never have been a high country in which towns existed. The high-road of Trajan was several feet below the present level of the marsh, and it is still constantly rising. The downs continue, but between Terracina and Circeii they leave an opening for the Ufens and other waters so far as they flow out of the marshes.

TOPOGRAPHY OF ROME.

I SHALL now at once proceed to say something about the topography of Rome; whether I shall be able afterwards to treat of this subject more in detail, depends upon circumstances; but for the present I will give you a general outline. It is a pity that without drawings it is almost impossible to form a clear idea. This is not the place for speaking about the origin of Rome, but I shall not abstain from noticing the most ancient divisions, and briefly to state their origin.

In very remote times, there existed, according to the most credible accounts, a small town on the Palatine hill; this town was probably called *Roma*, and its name was afterwards extended so as to embrace other neighbouring places. Another town existed on the Tarpeian hill opposite, occupying at the same time a portion of the Quirinal (not the whole of it); and I am convinced that I have discovered its name, which was undoubtedly *Quirium*. There are ancient statements that many small towns existed on the summits of the hills in that district—they may, in fact, have been no more than villages. One of these places was situated on mount Caelius, and undoubtedly bore the name of *Lucerum*. These three towns afterwards grew together, and extended south of the Palatine beyond the great chasm of the Circus as far as the higher and more important hill called the Aventine. This hill also contained a town, which at first, unless it was in friendly alliance, might become dangerous to the city; but when a portion of the Latins was admitted to the Roman franchise, they received settlements there, and in this manner that place likewise

became united with Rome. The Aventine being, as it were, an outpost, was connected with the city by means of a rampart extending to mount Caelius. These five hills, then, the Palatine, Quirinal, Capitoline, Caelius, and Aventine, formed together one whole, but each had separate rights, just as in Great Britain at the time when England and Scotland were united, and Ireland had its own parliament under British supremacy. A union existed between Roma and Quirium, while Lucerum, like Ireland, was dependent, though it had its own government; and the town on the Aventine stood in the relation of the English colonies. From the Caelian hill to the foot of the Quirinal another great fortification consisting of a mound and a ditch was formed, whereby the whole became united as one city; the Esquiline and Viminal were drawn into the city at a later period.

In ancient ethnography and history there occur numbers, which, in a surprising manner, recur at the most different periods; they are by no means fanciful; to regard them as something mystical, is itself a strange fancy, though there have been men of great intelligence, who have not been able to resist this notion. The number seven which so often meets us in Roman history, is something peculiar which has taken deep root there. There are unmistakeable traces that, previous to the complete union between the Romans and Quirites, Roma on the Palatine, Lucerum on the Caelius, and the town on the Aventine, together with their suburbs, formed one community, which was divided into seven districts, and bore the name of *Septimontium.* These seven hills were afterwards transferred to the whole of the city of Rome. Every one knows the passage in Virgil, *Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces*; but these are in part quite different hills from those originally comprised under the name Septimontium, which did not even consist of seven distinct hills.[1] They then were, the Palatine, Capitoline (formerly called Tarpeius), Quirinal,

[1] *Hist. of Rome,* vol.i. p.389, foll.

Viminal, Esquiline, Caelius, and Aventine. In this sense, and when all were enclosed by one wall, the Aventine also is reckoned as one of the seven hills, though otherwise it is not always regarded as a part of the city. In order not to go beyond the number seven, two very distinct hills, the Cispius and Oppius, were treated as one under the name Esquiline; the Aventine, at least in the opinion of the Romans, was the highest and most considerable of all; in order, therefore, not to leave it out, the two mentioned before were united into one. They can still be clearly distinguished, however much the forms of the hills have otherwise become obscured by ruins and rubbish: even the most indifferent observer will recognise them as two hills.

Within this circumference, Rome was contained after the *agger* of Servius Tullius was completed. This agger was an enormous work: it ran, almost an Italian mile, from the Colline to the Esquiline gate, and was a moat of one hundred feet in breadth and thirty in depth, the earth of which was thrown up as a mound lined with a wall and fortified with towers. In the time of Augustus this work was not only still discernible, but was used as a promenade, a kind of boulevard, of which Horace says, *aggere in aprico spatiari*; it continued to be admired even in Pliny's time, while the other walls were already destroyed. At present only few traces of it are visible; but I have no doubt that by excavations the lining wall might still be discovered. In some parts, the agger is still discernible as a continuous hill. Through this agger, then, the whole city became one united place. Although the city became greatly extended, by incorporating with itself suburbs and other hills, yet the additional hills were not counted, and Rome remained the city of the seven hills. One of the additions which the city received, was that of the *mons Pincius* or *Hortulorum*, on the other side of a wide valley, by which it was separated from the Quirinal: it derived its name from the palace of the Pincii, of which the ruins were to be seen as late as the sixteenth century; it is also remarkable as the place where

Belisarius in the sixth century had his head-quarters. Near the Aventine, another hill was added, to which the ancients do not give a distinct name, but which, during the middle ages, was strangely called *Asbestus*, which is perhaps a corruption of an ancient name. If it be not a mere invention, it is probable that a church may have stood there which was called *in Asbesto*. Nibby was the first to notice this, at least he first published it.[1] The suburb beyond the bridge (*trans Tiberim, Trastevere*) also was added, and in like manner the *Janiculus* became a part of the city, as well as another small hill in the neigbourhood of the second Aventine, the greater part of which, however, was outside the city. The number of hills which were regarded as belonging to the circumference of the city, thus already amounted to ten. In the ninth century, when the Borgo was built and St. Peter was fortified, the Vatican hill also was incorporated, so that at present the number of hills belonging to the city amounts to eleven. A great part of them, however, is now uninhabited, being covered by vineyards. But the division into seven parts had taken such firm root, that Augustus, in dividing the city into regions for the purpose of regulating the administration of the police, made fourteen regions; and this was wise and not a pedantic going back to obsolete institutions. This arrangement of Augustus was very necessary, for Rome was at that time little better than a den of robbers, as is usually the case in republics when the free constitution is not kept fresh and adapted to circumstances, when they become too vast, when morality decays, and when there arises a contradiction between the social condition of the nation and its constitution. In such circumstances the condition of a republic is the most fearful that can

[1] "I am of opinion that this hill did not belong to the Aventine: I have heard this at Rome from a man, in whom I do not place much confidence; he may perhaps have read it somewhere: there is so much that is indifferent in books, that we often pass over that which is of importance because we imagine it to be indifferent."

be imagined. The collective national wealth is never the main thing: I am convinced that in England, if the middle classes are destroyed (and such a middle class scarcely exists, for the people are either very rich or very poor), morals will decay, and that the nation will come to a point, where it can no longer enjoy its liberty, and will perish by internal convulsions: Hume has predicted this long ago. Whoever wishes to promote and preserve freedom, must first ask himself, Is it possible to preserve morality, virtue, and honesty? Have the morals of the people retained their purity? Do they respect themselves, their fellow-men, and God? If this is not the case, liberty is a curse and not a blessing. Such was the case of the Romans under Augustus: terrible as was his government, still there was no other way. In like manner, the revolution of the 18th Brumaire was the most fortunate event for France, and by it Napoleon did more for the country than by his victories. In his circumstances Augustus could not ask himself, "Is it not a handsome thing to preserve the ancient forms?" but, "What is the task I have to accomplish, especially how can I restore security?" For a man's life was not safe even in his bed. Rome and its vicinity were then probably even more unsafe than in our times; no one then could go from Rome to Albano without risking his life, whereas now even in the worst seasons no one has any thing to fear there. Whoever went out in the dark, had reason to be grateful, if he escaped with his life. Augustus, therefore, with a feeling that it could not be otherwise, divided the city into fourteen regions. In like manner the Christians in the earliest times divided themselves into seven deaneries or ecclesiastical regions, which, however, were by no means as distinctly marked as has sometimes been supposed; and it is evident from monuments that the ancient boundaries were not observed in them. This division into seven continued until a late period of the middle ages, and afterwards we find seven Cardinals, and seven civil dignitaries. Even at the present day Rome is divided into fourteen regions;

during the middle ages this number was not kept up, but Sixtus V. again made it up by adding the Borgo.

How much have these numbers been trifled with! The seven arms of the chandelier in the temple of Jerusalem, the seven days of the week, and even the seven planets have been pressed into the service to explain them. But such explanations may be found for any number. At the time of the French revolution I knew a good-natured man, who enthusiastically took up every change and demonstrated that, as man has five fingers and five senses, the Directoire and the Council of the Five Hundred was the most perfect form of government. When there were three consuls, he comprehended this too and found it quite natural; and when at last there was only one, he declared that it was all right, for that unity must prevail in nature. Such trifling with numbers is a bad thing.

I have already spoken to you about the physical character of the whole district. The ground is volcanic, the stones are tufo, and the loose soil puzzolano. These volcanic substances are very useful as cement and very durable. Wherever in architectural structures the ancients speak of *arena*, we have to understand puzzolano; we translate it indeed by "sand," but it is a volcanic sand. Thus we read in Cicero's speech for Cluentius that a dead body was found in a sand-pit (*arenaria*); such pits were dug very deep and were very extensive. Of the same kind are the catacombs at Rome: they are large subterraneous passages, which, if due care was taken in their construction, did not fall in. In my lectures on Roman antiquities, I have said that these catacombs were the ordinary burial places for the poor. This much may suffice about the hills.

In the earliest times, the Tiber extended between the Palatine and the Aventine, for there the river, as I have already remarked, formed a bay of the sea, and the district between the Tarpeian and the Palatine hills was a marsh, which, when the waters rose high, became a lake: afterwards this place was the *Forum*. The valley between the

Palatine and Aventine was always filled with water, independent of inundations, for the river there formed a real bay: this district was called the *Velabrum*. Rome consisted, for the most part, of isolated patches of houses on the hills, for the marsh extended from the Forum to the valley between the Viminal and Esquiline. When you examine the history of the restoration of the city, and inquire as to which district was marshy, you find that even now the place once occupied by the Forum Augusti is called Pantani (marsh). For the purpose of draining this marsh, the Romans built the sewers, which are ascribed to one of the Tarquins — it is uncertain whether to the father or to the son—and which still exist. The intention was to drain the whole of the lower districts between the Palatine, Aventine, Capitoline, Esquiline, and the sea, to facilitate the communication between the several hills, to render the plain fit for agriculture, instead of cultivating only the sides of the hills, and at the same time to make the city inhabitable in regard to fortifications: in like manner London has, within a period of twenty years, become an entirely new city; for many thousands of houses have been bought and pulled down for the purpose of making the streets broader. It was necessary to make an embankment by the river side in order to obtain firm ground behind it, and then to build the great sewers (*cloacae*). We must not conceive these works to be executed according to our dwarfish notions: they were large vaults receiving the waters of the low districts and carrying them into the river; I always feel sorry to be obliged to use an ignoble name for those magnificent works. The marsh then had to be filled up, which is not indeed mentioned by the ancients, but is self-evident. Afterwards, these cloacae were extended at different times, under the Forum as far as the Subura between the Viminal and the Esquiline, so that all those districts were drained by a vast system of sewers. Thus Rome, throughout this extent, was reclaimed as building ground. I shall afterwards have to say something more about these cloacae.

Most Italian towns were in ancient times situated on hills, but were then not surrounded with walls any more than the Epirot towns, but localities were chosen where a hill was naturally inaccessible, or it was made inaccessible by artificial means. The hill Moriah, on which king Solomon built the temple, was originally such a hill, and it still preserves its square form amid its ruins. The ancients at most drew a wall around the base of the hill, which was either a Cyclopean or an Etruscan (i.e., a regular) wall, so as to render it inaccessible;[1] at the top of the hill there was no wall, at most a small bulwark, but in most cases even this did not exist. A sloping road (*clivus*) with two towers at the foot led up the hill, and along it ran a portico, or two walls, usually built in a zigzag. At the top there was another gate which could be closed, and which was generally flanked by two towers, so that the access might be closed both at the foot and at the top. Such was in general the character of the Latin towns, more or less perfect, and built regularly or irregularly according to the nature of the locality; and of this kind must have been the small Latin and Sabine towns out of which arose the eternal city. These places stood quite isolated, and each had its own arx, which perfectly explains Virgil's expression *Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces;* these were the strong places in Rome itself, which are so often mentioned by Livy and Dionysius. Rome, therefore, had not one arx, but seven. These seven arces were then connected by means of the agger, which extended from the Colline to the Esquiline gate. In some parts of this circumference the ancient fortification remained; for example, the Quirinal (which was so high that it was necessary to make a flight of steps, which was transferred in the fourteenth century to Araceli[2]) had one very precipitous side, which required no fortification; but from it to the Capitoline a wall was built. Thence the fortification pro-

[1] *Lect. on Rom. Hist.*, vol. i. p. 60, 3d edit.

[2] Respecting this flight of steps, however, see Urlichs in the *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.* vol. iii. 2, p. 373, and the same author in his *Beschreib. Roms,* p. 256.

ceeded to the corner of the Aventine. This course of the ancient walls has been mistaken by all antiquarians, except a few belonging to the sixteenth century; I discovered its real course from the nature of the circumstances; I lived in the neighbourhood, and found the remains, for on the one side of the street there runs a ridge of ruins. This wall alone prevented the Tiber from overflowing the Forum, while outside the gate the inundations were very great; when, therefore, in the seventh century the wall was neglected, the Forum and the adjoining districts, as far as the porta Carmentalis, were completely inundated. In ancient Rome, this could not have happened. The Aventine is still high enough to show, that properly it required no wall, and its precipitous side towards the river may still be seen; but from that point again a wall runs towards the Caelius, for the most part behind the ditch which is now called Marrana, but anciently (Pliny) bore the name of *fossa Quiritium*. Coming from the Campagna this ditch runs along the foot of the Caelius, traverses the valley of the Murcia towards the river, and in the Circus it appears as a Euripus. Of the wall from the Aventine to the Caelius traces likewise still exist in the ridge of ruins in the lanes of that district. This fortification, then, closed the valley between the Caelius and Palatine. The Caelius was probably surrounded by a wall, for its sides cannot have been steep enough to protect it. The wall then proceeded through the valley towards the Esquiline gate, and was thus carried to the point where it joined the agger. This circumference of the city amounted to somewhat more than five English miles, and is known under the name of the wall of Servius Tullius (*recinto di Servio Tullio, murus Servii regis*, in Pliny). The wall did not run round the whole city, for along the Quirinal and the Capitoline there was no real wall. The *insula Tiberina* is in the reach of the river, which in the west of the city forms the *Campus Martius*, a perfect plain outside the ancient city. At present this plain is covered with scattered hillocks which have been

formed by rubbish deposited there; there were also a few marshes, but not as many as Brocchi asserts.

The *Marrana* is a ditch running from Alba to Rome, respecting which antiquarians are strangely mistaken, and about which the most singular conjectures have been propounded. It is supposed that it is not mentioned in the works of the ancients; while some think that it is the *aqua damnata*, an aqueduct, and others that it is the *aqua crabra*, a beautiful spring, which, however, has its source near Tusculum, and is for the most part consumed there. But the Marrana is nothing but a ditch: in the vale of Grotta ferrata there existed in ancient times a lake, which had two outlets for its waters, one channel being cut through to the Anio, and the other a tunnel cut through the rock. I am sorry to say that I have not seen it myself, but I have read of it in the work, "De aquis et aquaeductibus," by Fabretti, a scholar of the seventeenth century; his work is very excellent, and I only regret that I did not read it until I had left Rome; it contains a number of original investigations, for the author did not, like many others, confine himself to studying antiquities from books. Fabretti discovered the *Fossa Cluilia* at the foot of a hill near Frascati, on which are situated the Centroni. They were pointed out to me by an aged peasant, for, wherever it was possible, I tried to make the acquaintance of country people, who very often know something about the ruins which we find mentioned in old books. It has for a long time been the misfortune of foreigners at Rome, not to see more than what is noticed in books. There are, for example, three pillars, remnants of a portico, in a cellar not far from the place in which I lived; and I was apprised of their existence by an old man who was a scholar. Another likewise very interesting ruin exists in a vault under the Capitol; to judge from the style of architecture, it cannot be of a more recent date than the age of Augustus; I have, unfortunately, not seen it myself, but a friend has sent me a description of it. Fabretti calls the tunnel of which I

spoke before, an *opus priscae magnificentiae.* This is the *Fossa Cluilia*, by means of which the valley was drained; it is a work of Alban origin; its continuation towards Rome was called *Fossa Quiritium*, and is the present Marrana. From this fact we may, at the risk of not going wrong more than a hundred paces, fix the spot on which the ancients conceived the combat between the Horatii and Curiatii to have taken place: respecting this point also the most erroneous notions have prevailed. By the same means, we are enabled accurately to point out the boundary line of Latium, and the spot where the Romans thought Coriolanus to have been encamped. These facts have occurred to no one, because nobody remembered that, before Appius Claudius made the via Appia, the via Latina was the only road in that direction. The Fossa Quiritium was regarded as the work of Ancus Martius; it runs between the Aventine and Palatine into the Velabrum, and terminates in the cloacae.

In most maps the walls of Rome are seen continued in the form of a triangle beyond the Tiber towards the Janiculus; the walls forming σκέλη proceeding from the Capitol and the Aventine. But this is altogether a mistake. In the age of Augustus, suburbs certainly did exist beyond the Tiber, and I have reasons for supposing that they existed there even at the period of the republic, at least in the seventh century. But it is a mistake to continue the walls so far, for the Romans had long ceased heeding the walls in extending their city. The following circumstance is a proof of this: Rome had only a single bridge across the Tiber, viz. the Pons Sublicius. Now it is said, that the Fabii went out by the Porta Carmentalis, and then proceeded across the bridge into the Etruscan territory. They passed through the Porta Carmentalis because they dwelt on the Quirinal; if they had lived on the Aventine, they would have passed through the Porta Flumentana. The bridge, therefore, evidently lay outside the walls, for otherwise they would have had to pass through two gates,

and two gates would have become *nefastae*. Moreover, Varro, "De Lingua Latina," says, that the *carceres* of the Circus Maximus were close to the wall of the city,[1] which in his sense is perfectly correct; for the *carceres* cannot have been more than a stone's throw from the wall which ran from the Capitoline to the Aventine.

The city was spacious even within the circumference given to it by Servius, but it ever increased, and suburbs sprang up around it. The first trace of such a suburb occurs in the second Punic war. If we possessed the second decad of Livy, we should perhaps find that it existed even at an earlier period. The account of a great conflagration, which occurred during the Hannibalian war, shows that a large and beautiful suburb existed in the district between the Capitoline, Aventine, the Circus Maximus, and the river, that is, in the region of the *Forum olitorium*, *extra portam Flumentanam*.

It is natural that in a city like Rome, which had already become the capital of a great empire, the empty spaces within the walls were gradually filled up, and that the ancient *luci*, especially about the Esquiline, were more and more cleared away and filled up with buildings. The extension of large cities generally takes the direction of the principal streets: when, for example, cities like Paris and London extend, the newly-built houses follow the lines of the main streets, and are continued outside the gates; the streets thus become lengthened, and are intersected by cross roads. But this system had at Rome to contend with a difficulty, which is generally overlooked. It was customary with the ancients, not only at Rome but also in the Greek cities, to build sepulchres outside the gates on both sides of the road. The ruins of Pompeii show this distinctly. It was accordingly impossible to continue the buildings there, without destroying the tombs. The sepulchral monuments

[1] v. § 153, ed. Müller, who, however, gives his own conjecture *ad muri speciem* instead of the common reading *a muri parte*. The MSS. have *a muris partem*.—Ed.

at Rome were subsequently destroyed by barbarism and fanaticism; as most of them were of marble and other costly stones, they were demolished for the sake of plunder. The district of the tombs has now a frightful appearance: the via Appia looks like a corpse, and no one visits it. During summer, when one might be inclined to go there, the country is covered with corn-fields, and in winter herds of cattle graze there; and the herdsmen are generally accompanied by large dogs which attack strangers with great fury; Goethe was in danger of losing his life in that district. The herdsmen are suspected of sometimes causing strangers to be torn to pieces in order to be able to rob them, whence it is necessary to arm one's self when visiting the district. From an eminence in the neighbourhood you can see the course of the ancient road to a considerable distance, and along it you see nothing but tombs in ruins. Some of them, as we know from Boissard's description, were entire as late as the sixteenth century; but the Romans have demolished and carried away every thing, and not a stone of any value has been left. The whole of this road was a succession of tombs, it was a real necropolis like that of Alexandria. Hence Rome was always extended between two diverging roads, and gardens were thus formed between the open country and the fields. In ancient Rome you must well distinguish between *horti* and *villae*; at present we make no distinction, and the name *villa* is applied to a house in a garden, even within the walls of a city; but in ancient times a villa was always at a considerable distance from the city. *Horti*, on the other hand, still called *orti*, originally signified mere orchards in the vicinity of the city. Such *horti* were bought by the wealthy at the time when the city became too confined, and having purchased many of them together they built palaces with suitable pleasure grounds in those districts between the great high roads. Thus Scipio, in the work "De Re Publica," is said to have made up his mind to be *in hortis*. I have discovered

the *horti Aemilii,* which were situated on the border of the Campus Martius. Such studies and inquiries make a residence at Rome extremely attractive. In the first year I could not see my way clearly, but afterwards, when I had once discovered the thread, I became quite at home there. Had it not been for my family and the education of my children, whom I was anxious to have brought up in the German way, I could never have resolved to quit Rome, because ancient Rome became daily more clear and vivid before my mind, while modern Rome disappeared more and more from my view; the climate also agreed very well with me. The large palaces, to return to my subject, were situated outside the ancient walls. It is a most erroneous opinion that the palace of Maecenas was situated on the spot afterwards occupied by the Thermae of Titus; for it was outside the wall in the Campus Esquilinus.

The city now became extended in various ways. Industrious artizans established themselves by the river-side, and also on the other side of it (*trans Tiberim*). That this latter district was inhabited as a distinct quarter as early as the time of Augustus, is evident from the fact, that he made it a separate region; and this is at the same time a proof that it was thickly peopled. For although most other regions were of nearly equal extent, this one was comparatively small, which arose from the circumstance, that the great mass and the condition of its inhabitants required a more watchful vigilance of the police. This is the reason why that region was smaller than those in other parts. For opposite reasons, another region near the Porta Capena, in which the population was more dispersed, and which contained more palaces, was made unusually large. Suburbs existed as early as the Punic wars, and in the time of Marius and Sulla, the whole city was surrounded with suburbs; the ancient walls were then forgotten, and it seems that, for the purpose of removing all impediments of communication, even the gates were taken off their hinges.

Along the river there was no obstacle, hence buildings were erected there under the Capitoline and Palatine.[1] It is commonly imagined that the whole district at the reach of the Tiber was called Campus Martius, but the Campus occupied only a part of it. At the foot of the Quirinal, too, buildings were erected, and all these enlargements may have narrowed the Campus Martius. In other parts the gardens were isolated, not forming a connected quarter. One suburb was situated at the distance of a Roman mile from the city, on the Appian road; it was even outside the Aurelian wall, which is still standing, and was called *ad Martis*.

When the city had become thus enlarged, there followed the conflagration of Nero, the effects of which have not yet been made clear, but I hope some time to be able to give a satisfactory account of it. The Palatine, a part of Caelius and the district about the Circus were, perhaps, completely reduced to ashes; so also the Via Flaminia on the west of the Capitol; but other parts were less injured.

In Pliny (iii. 9), we meet with the strange expression: *Moenia ejus collegere ambitu Imperatoribus Censoribusque Vespasianis, anno conditae* DCCCXXVII. *pass.* XIIIMCC., an expression which proves in a striking manner that an accurate knowledge of language and etymology cannot be dispensed with, even in matters which we observe with our own eyes. It has been unjustly inferred from this passage, that in the reign of Vespasian Rome was provided with walls, and those, too, of a much wider circumference than those of Servius. This arose from ignorance of the fact that, according to the most ancient Roman usage, *moenia* always signifies "buildings." In like manner, Virgil's expression,

[1] In one set of notes, the following passage occurs on p. 53, after the word "necropolis," line 17 from foot, and may perhaps be introduced here: "There was no road between the Aventine and the river; outside the Porta Collina, Esquilina, Caelimontana, and Carmentalis no enlargement of the city could take place."—Ed.

Dividimus muros et moenia pandimus urbis, contains no tautology, as was well-known to the ancient grammarians, for the meaning is: "we break the walls, and thereby lay open the buildings of the city." So also Florus, who sometimes follows the ancient usage, says: *hic igitur et moenia muro amplexus*. We must accordingly understand the passage of Pliny as comprising the whole complex of Rome, as it was measured in the time of Vespasian, which, of course, is a variable magnitude. As it is generally understood, the expression would be as absurd, as if I were to say: the walls of the city of Cologne, in 1828, were of such or such an extent, having, of course, had the same circumference two hundred years ago. Rome had long since been extended beyond the ancient walls, which were now, in fact, in the midst of the city; the towers had been taken down, and people built houses there, the interdicts against building on the pomoerium being no longer attended to. In like manner the foundations of the ancient walls of London may still be discerned among the houses. From Frontinus' work on Aqueducts, we see how, though the police was excellent, abuses had crept in, although not as many as at present, because the lower administration was not carried on in so servile a manner; when an experienced man was entrusted with the superintendence, things went on fairly, but if not, every one took the greatest liberty. Such was the case at Rome, until Frontinus came forward as a reformer. The disorder was then so great that any one built a house wherever he pleased, without asking whether he had a right to do so or not; and hence the city ever continued to extend. I have made a series of observations on the origin of particular buildings, in order to see approximately, how the city became enlarged under the several emperors. In the reign of Augustus, the Campus Martius was principally chosen for the erection of large buildings: there Agrippa built his Thermae and the Pantheon, and Augustus his Mausoleum; for the Campus was no longer the plain for reviewing the

citizens, nor were the mock-comitia of the centuries held there any longer, but it was confined to a small plain near the river, as may be seen from Pliny's panegyric on Trajan. This part of the Campus, according to a regulation of Agrippa, was watered throughout the summer, and hence always presented a green lawn. The summer is at Rome much more terrible than winter, for the grass is scorched to its very roots; in September it is green, but in July and the dreadful month of August, all the foliage is scorched and covered with dust, so that it presents the most melancholy appearance, and the grounds, like the fields, are, nearly as in Egypt, a picture of death.—In the time of Trajan the Romans built in the same way as is now done in London, where people do not only enlarge the town, but spare no expenses in embellishing it. Enormous works were undertaken in the interior, merely to gain ground. To make room for the Forum of Trajan, a part of the Quirinal was taken down, and many houses were demolished to gain the magnificent space, so that it cost many millions before the foundations could be laid. Antonine erected in the Campus Martius his basilica, his column, and other edifices. Rome was, in fact, ever increasing down to the third century. Even in the time of Alexander Severus, although there existed men of great intelligence, very few seem to have suspected that the nation was in a state of decay, and that a destructive storm was approaching. Dangers in which the empire might have perished did not become visible until the reign of Decius, when the German tribes, the Goths, Alemanni, and Longobards (Juthungi) crossed the boundaries of the empire. They penetrated as far as the river Po, and as Marius had conquered the Cimbri, so Aurelian defeated those tribes in the north of the Po, and saved Italy. Aurelian now found it necessary to surround the city with a new wall, which was essentially the same as the present one. He did not comprise all the suburbs within its circumference, but was guided by the course of the hills; the whole of the *Collis hortulorum*, however, and

the mighty ravine in the neighbourhood were drawn into it and fortified. This wall was exceedingly strong: in the east he was obliged, as Servius had done before, to raise it to a great height.

This was the circumference of Rome, until Leo IV. drew the Vatican into the city and surrounded it with a wall. In the sixteenth century the Vatican was connected with Trastevere by means of the Lungara; and thus arose the present circumference, a fact which cannot be denied, although it has been inferred that the wall was fifteen Roman miles in circumference.[1] The present walls are altogether restorations, and probably no part of them belongs to Aurelian. Under the later emperors they again fell into decay; previous to the siege by the Goths, Honorius ordered them to be cleared of the heaps of rubbish which had accumulated by the side of them, and to be restored (*egestis immensibus ruderibus*). Afterwards one third of the wall was demolished by Totilas. Very few of the gates belonging to the time of Honorius now exist, as is clear from the inscriptions; they can be clearly distinguished from those which were built in the sixth century under Gregory the Great, who restored them in every way, for the purpose of protecting the city against the Lombards.

The walls of Servius and Aurelian, although the facts were known, were by no means properly distinguished by the antiquarians and commentators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was only in the eighteenth century that a correct notion was formed of the course of the walls of Rome, and the great D'Anville in this matter also showed his keen judgment and ready tact, although his outline, too, is not quite correct. The more ancient the antiquarians are, the less do they distinguish between the two walls; they sought the Esquiline and Colline gates in the line of the present wall, though they must have known that this did not accord with all the rest; but where a difficulty occurred they helped themselves by accommoda-

[1] Compare Bunsen in the *Beschreib. der Stadt Rom*, i. p. 646, foll.

tion. At present the matter has been made pretty clear; Nibby's work on the Roman walls contains for the most part correct views.

I will now proceed to enumerate the gates, as they are extremely important in the earliest history of Rome. It is said that the most ancient Rome on the Palatine had three gates; but this must be understood to refer to the extent of Rome comprising the plain round the Palatine, where a suburb was separated by means of a trench and palisades. These gates are not the same in all authors; the *Porta Mugonia* alone, near the temple in the Via Nova, is historical; it is mentioned by Solinus, and Tarquinius Priscus is said to have dwelt there. You must not, therefore, seek for these gates on the hill, but below Cermalus.

The northernmost gate is the *Porta Collina*, near the Quirinal, where the mound of Servius Tullius began. Before it there is a field, and then comes the valley across which you pass through the gardens of Sallust towards Monte Pincio. Here, on the road to the Porta Salara[1], we must conceive the point where Hannibal rode up to the walls of Rome, and hurled his spear into the city, and where Sulla defeated the Samnites. The *Porta Esquilina* was at the other end of the Servian agger, and between them was the *Porta Viminalis*. Ficoroni has very successfully made out the site of the Porta Esquilina behind the church of S. Maria Maggiore. After the Esquiline gate there follows the *Caelimontana*, the site of which cannot be accurately determined; but that the arch on the Caelius with an inscription by Dolabella[2], is not a Roman gate, is obvious to any one who has a notion of the structure of a Roman gate. Then comes the *Porta Capena*, in the valley below the Caelius. Piranesi, an intelligent and clever

[1] Some MSS. here have a name, which seems to suggest the *Porta Pia*. Bunsen says, "at the juncture of the street of the Porta Pia with the street of Porta Salara" (*Beschreib. d. Stadt Rom*, i. p. 625).—Ed.

[2] See the *Beschreib. der Stadt Rom*, iii. 1. p. 490.

man, discovered it about fifty years ago by well conducted excavations; but the spot has been covered over again, and not even a mark has been put there. Then follows the *Porta Naevia* near the Aventine, whether on the side towards the Caelius, or at the southern extremity, on the spot where now the bulwark of Paul III. exists, cannot be ascertained. This gate is the largest. In order to discover any thing more definite about it, it would be necessary to make excavations, and it would have made me extremely happy, if I had been allowed to do so. But gladly as I would have done it, even at my own expense, I had to struggle with too great difficulties, especially caused by Monsignor Fea, who always had some objection, when a proposal was made, although he had no certain conviction of his own. He generally thwarted my attempts. When once by accident he consented to Count Funchal making excavations on the Capitol, the thing sought for was found. He never would be wrong, though he is otherwise an honest man, and has the reputation of great disinterestedness; but he is arrogant, confident, and impertinent; he becomes enraged, and never allows a matter to be inquired into, and to prevent it he would even have recourse to intrigues and tricks. Thus, although I wished to make excavations at my own expense, and although I offered to take nothing for myself, and to surrender every thing to the Papal government—I only wished to copy what I might find—still I could not obtain permission. And this was done, in order that new discoveries might not overthrow the current theories. But I understand that things are now going on better.

In that district there are two gates, the *Rauduscula*na, probably at the southern extremity, and the *Naevia*. Then came the *Porta Trigemina*, below the Aventine, between it and the Tiber, just as the Capena was below the Caelius. Whence the Trigemina derived its name I will mention after the enumeration of the gates, when I shall have to speak of their construction. The *Porta Flumentana* was

between the Circus and the river. The last important gate, the *Porta Carmentalis*, was between the Capitol and the Quirinal. Thus we again reach the Collina by the long line of the Quirinal.

These are the more important gates of Rome, but there were several others besides. I have given you a list of them, because they are generally stated erroneously from the Naevia onwards. I cannot here attempt to prove my statements, for it would be impossible for you to appreciate or examine the arguments, but you will give me credit, that I have said nothing but what, according to my full conviction, is correct, and I can speak to you with that confidence as if I had seen the objects only a moment ago. Independently of the large gates, there must have been some smaller door-ways, especially in the long line between the Porta Carmentalis and Collina, but in some other parts also, in which cases a flight of steps must have led down the hills. These smaller means of egress came more and more into use at the time when the fortifications had become unnecessary, and when Rome was enlarged beyond the walls. During the period of the republic, the Romans had no excise duties, which were not introduced until the time of the emperors; hence I see no reason why such means of egress should have been forbidden.

The peculiarity of the Roman gates is, that they had two arches by the side of each other, as is the case in the Porta Nigra at Treves, for there can be no doubt that the Porta Nigra was a Roman gate, with a basilica on each side of it. Each of these two arches was called *Janus*, the one *Janus dexter*, and the other *Janus sinister*; by the former people left the town, and by the latter they entered it; and every person kept to the right in order to avoid crowding and collision. The Porta Trigemina must have had a threefold Janus, though I cannot conjecture for what reason; it is possible that the third was destined for vehicles, or that it was a mere ornament. Strange opinions are current about this gate, as, for example, that the Horatii

and Curiatii passed through it; but this is impossible, they must have gone out by the Porta Capena.

Over the Capena there ran an aqueduct, which in the reign of Domitian must have been damaged, whence Juvenal and Martial speak of *madida Capena.*

The Porta Carmentalis can be regarded as a gate of the Capitol only in an improper sense; it was connected only with the continuation of the *clivus Capitolinus.*

The circumference of the walls of Servius Tullius thus contained ten gates. Some of them derived their names from the hills; the Collina from the Collis Quirinalis, which was pre-eminently called *the* Collis, the Capena probably owed its name to the fact of its leading to Capua, or to the *lucus Capenas*, the grove of the Camenae; the Naevia to the Silva Naevia, the Carmentalis to a sanctuary of Carmentis in the neighbourhood, the Rauduscula na to the fact of its being covered with brass, and the Flumentana to the river.

The larger circumference of the wall of Aurelian extended as far as the banks of the Tiber, where now no wall exists, because the Borgo and the Castel Angelo are united with the city. On the left bank the foundations of the wall are still the same, though the walls themselves have at different times been entirely restored. Not a stone of the ancient wall now remains, and if there should be any, they belong to the restoration of Honorius. Totilas demolished the greater part of it; afterwards it was repeatedly destroyed and restored again.[1]

The gates of the wall of Aurelian were called after the streets from which they led. In former times a large road led from the Porta Collina northward, and branched off into two, the *Via Salaria* and the *Via Nomentana;* the Via Tiburtina, afterwards called *Valeria*, issued from the Porta Viminalis; and another issued from the Porta Esquilina, which branched off into the *Via Praenestina* and the *Via Labicana.* The *Via Appia* and *Via Latina* began at the

[1] Compare above, p. 58.

Capena, and a road branching off from the Appia was called *Campana*.[1] The *Via Ardeatina* proceeded from the Porta Rauduscula na, while the *Via Ostiensis* issued from the Porta Naevia or Trigemina, for these two must have been near each other. The *Via Portuensis* was on the other side of the river, and the *Via Cassia* ran over the hill; from the bridge *Pons Aelius*, a street ran close by the mausoleum of Hadrian, which probably bore the name of *Via Aelia;* but the matter is obscure. The *Via Flaminia* proceeded straightway from the Porta Carmentalis to Ariminum.

Not one of these roads was blocked up by the wall of Aurelian, and wherever gates were made in the latter, they received their names from the streets into which they led. Thus we find the Porta Flaminia, Porta Pinciana (a secondary gate near the Collina, leading probably to a less important way, not a high-road, a gate being necessary for the palace), P. Salaria, P. Nomentana, and then two Portae Tiburtinae, because there were two roads leading to Tibur; one of these gates seems to have had no particular name of its own, though it may have been called P. Valeria. Next came the P. Praenestina and Labicana, both in one building, though distinct; P. Metronia (probably named after a palace), P. Latina, P. Asinaria (P. S. Giovanni), P. Appia, P. Ardeatina, P. Ostiensis, beyond the river P. Portuensis, P. Septimiana or Aurelia, between the Janiculus and the river, probably named after the Thermae of Septimius Severus; and at the bridge (Pons Aelius) the P. Aelia. With the exception of the Pincia and Metronia, you still find almost the same gates leading to the same roads. This circumference of Rome is mentioned by Procopius in his account of the siege of the city. In the sixth century a change took place in the nomenclature, many gates receiving new names from the nearest important churches: thus the P. Asinaria was at a very early date called P. S. Giovanni; the P. Appia, P. S. Sebastiani, from a basilica; the P. Ostiensis,

[1] I have supplied this name, the MSS. containing something which is evidently quite misunderstood.—Ed.

S. Pauli; P. Aurelia, S. Pancratii; the P. S. Lorenzo (Praenestina) also received its name from the basilica S. Laurentii. The P. Salaria and Nomentana retained their names until the sixteenth century.

I cannot enter so fully into the topography of Rome as to show you how the streets of Rome were continued throughout Italy and the whole Roman empire. But, as architectural structures, the Roman high-roads are the most magnificent remains of antiquity. They consist of polished polygons of basalt: the foundation was formed of large stones, more than a cubit deep; over them was laid a stratum of mortar made of lime and puzzolano. Upon this a kind of excellent bricks were broken in large pieces, and laid in strata, over which again a cement was poured, which completely hardened into stone. Upon this substratum the blocks of basalt were placed, the lower surface of which was cut perfectly smooth. The polygons were very large, but different in circumference; they are so well fitted together, that in many parts the point of a pen-knife cannot be pressed between them; they were cut with great care, and must have been polished in a peculiar manner. A line is seen between two stones, but there is no interstice. Even if accidentally the water penetrated from above, the lower part was perfectly waterproof. It is well known that roads are mainly injured by water. Whoever has seen those ancient roads, despises the wretched structures of modern times; but if we were to build them now in the same manner, we should be obliged to sacrifice their external beauty and cover them with sand, because horses shod with iron would not be able to run on the surface, which is as smooth as a mirror. The horses of the ancients were not shod, and mules had either a kind of wooden shoes or soles of matting. Near and at Tivoli large parts of such roads exist in a state of preservation so perfect, as if they had been made only a year ago; but no vehicles now go over them. In comparison with ourselves, the ancients used carriages very rarely, and burdens were mostly carried

by mules. On each side of the road there was a pavement for foot-passengers, and at intervals stones were set up, to enable men to get upon their horses, as stirrups were unknown.

In regard to the interior of Rome, it is erroneous to speak only of hills, for in later times they constituted only the smallest part of the city; a great portion being situated in valleys and another in plains. But I will first speak of the hills.

The real centre of the later city consisted of the *Capitoline Hill,* which, though not of great circumference, is properly composed of two hills, a southern one towards the Forum, and a northern one; between them a considerable depression of the ground is still visible. This depression, however, was far greater in ancient times than it is now, and in it there was a portico open on both sides, but at present its back is filled up with rubbish, especially from the ruins of the Capitoline temple, which, like many other buildings, has been purposely and barbarously destroyed. There was a *clivus* leading up the Capitoline hill from the Forum, which, as in the case of all the Roman hills, formed an inclined plain ascending gradually. The names of the *clivi* of all the other hills, however, are not known. On the Quirinal I do not find a *clivus*, but it had a *semita.* The meaning of this latter term is not correctly given in our dictionaries: the *semita* does not differ so much from a carriage road by being less in breadth, but it is altogether a way which no vehicles can pass, either from its want of breadth, or from its construction in other respects, and which therefore is available only to foot-passengers and mules; *semitae* were ways like the one still existing in the Vatican palace, by which the pope can ride on a mule into his own apartment. In Germany there is nothing comparable to it; the Italian name is *cordonata*, and it must be conceived as a strongly, though not inconveniently, inclined plain, with high stones at certain intervals for the purpose of stopping, so that the second step begins lower

than the point at which the first left off.[1] Semitae are also found at gates, especially of Cyclopean towns, as at Ferentino. Before the time of Trajan there is no trace of a clivus leading up the Quirinal; on the Esquiline I can prove its existence; the Palatine had two clivi, the Aventine one, etc.

Rome was essentially different from large modern cities which always contain main streets running from one end to the other; such a street cannot be shown to have existed at Rome, which altogether had but few great streets. All the houses built on the same hill formed, as it were, a small town by themselves with little, and probably extremely irregular, streets, and thus every hill was isolated. It was only the plains and valleys that contained some large streets. The *Esquiliae* were not a separate street, and the *Carinae* near the Esquiline also were a quarter of the city rather than a street; the *Subura* beyond the Esquiliae was a real street, and so also the *Via Sacra* up to a certain point, but it was not a main street.

The intermontium of the Capitoline hill contained the *asylum.* The southern half of the Capitol, towards both the Tiber and the Forum, formed the *Tarpeian Rock,* which did not, as is commonly believed, consist of one side only. A French scholar, Dureau de la Malle, several years ago wrote an excellent essay on this subject, entitled "Mémoire sur la position de la roche Tarpéienne, lu à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres." The same scholar is the author of a very able translation of Tacitus; he has been at Rome, and his work furnishes evidence of very correct observations and sound judgment. The Tarpeian rock was cut quite precipitous, a circumstance which at present is not visible everywhere, because houses of six and seven stories in height were built there, which, when demolished in the time of destruction, formed heaps of rubbish as high as two-thirds of the rock, and upon this rubbish houses were afterwards erected.

[1] Comp. *Hist. of Rome,* vol. iii. p. 304, note 518.

In one part of the rock there was a flight of one hundred steps, which was visible as late as the twelfth century.

The exact site of the Capitoline temple is a much disputed question among antiquarians; it is strange that no ruins of it are remaining. The old opinion which was generally adopted until the time of Nardini, is the true one: Fulvius, Marliani, and Donati all agreed in stating that the temple was situated on the southern part of the hill; but Nardini perverts the whole matter by placing it on the north side on the site now occupied by the church and convent of Araceli; the northern part formed the *arx*, as is clear from the history of the Gallic war; it was a very steep height, not a fortress, but only a strong point, and was occupied by houses of private citizens.

The Capitoline temple was built by the kings and completed by the first consuls; it was then consumed by fire in the time of Sulla, but was restored and consecrated by Catulus. It was burnt down a second time under Vitellius, after which Vespasian rebuilt it with great splendour. Twelve years later, fire again broke out in an unaccountable manner, and Domitian restored it a third time. The immense splendour lavished upon it was probably the principal cause of its subsequent total destruction; it is scarcely possible to form any idea of its costly ornaments: the gates were of bronze covered with thick and solid plates of wrought gold. This gilding alone is said to have cost more than two millions sterling. Even the tiles which Genseric carried away were gilt.[1]

All ancient temples consist of two main parts, the cella and the space in front of the cella. The latter might be

[1] "I will mention only one example, to show how rich the Roman gildings were. In the Forum of Trajan the letters of an inscription were cut into the rock, and the letters themselves consisting of gilt metal were sunk into the openings. This is the method according to which the letters of inscriptions were generally put. In others the bronze letters were nailed to the wall, traces of which are still visible on the triumphal arch at Nismes, and French scholars have very ingeniously attempted from these holes of the

constructed in different ways, it might be sheltered by a roof, or exposed to the open air, in which case it was enclosed by four walls or a portico all around. We generally imagine the altar to have been in the temple itself; in the ancient Christian churches (*basilicae*) it always stood in the *apsis*, but in the temples it did not belong to the cella of the gods, but to the space in front of it. The cella was generally open, but could be closed; it was usually very small. The Roman temples often were of extremely small dimensions, and at present I scarcely know a chapel of an equally small size, not even in Italy, where there are some incredibly little chapels; for there were temples of which the cella was only seven or eight feet in diameter. The cella contained the statue of the god (τὸ ἕδος), and for this reason it was necessary to have the altar outside in the centre of the space in front of the cella, which was either exposed to the open air, or could easily be aired, because the statue, in consequence of the burnt sacrifices, might have become disfigured by smoke or otherwise, and because the bones and the like might easily have created foul air in the cella and thus produced injurious effects. In the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter, the cella was divided into three sacella, separated by walls, for Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. But this cella was only the smallest part of the building; the larger was the space before it, where the ordinary donaria were hung up, except the more precious gifts, which were kept in the favissae, or large catacombs under the temple in the lautumiae. It is possible that they might still be discovered; a few traces of them are visible in the garden of duke Caffarelli. In the twelfth century, under Pope Anacletus II., large ruins still existed; but a church was erected upon them, which bore the name *S. Salvatoris in maximis* (supply *ruinis*), but has been destroyed

---

nails to make out the whole incription. In the Forum of Trajan a bronze letter has been found, the gilding of which was valued at a ducat; all the rest had of course been carried off as plunder."

long ago. Such names must always be attended to, for they often lead to important discoveries. The heaps of rubbish lying below by the side of the river, belong no doubt to the temple, and if excavations were made, many valuable treasures might be discovered. I often proposed in vain to dig in the favissae, but as I have given some impulse, I hope people will be roused from their indifference.[1]

The hills not only had the same extent which they still have, but must have extended much further at the time when the valleys were more distinct. Thus a part of the Forum, properly speaking, belonged to the Capitoline hill. The *carcer* was at the north-eastern extremity; its construction is ascribed to Ancus Marcius, the founder of the plebeian order; it seems to have been intended for the plebeians, for the patricians would probably not have tolerated the idea of such a thing.

The *Forum* was situated below the Capitoline hill, between it and the Palatine. This is the real point from which the reform of the topography of Rome must proceed, for point by point can be established by the aid of the ancient authors. I there made the beginning of some happy discoveries, which, however, were not continued, because those who have it in their power to grant permission, are afraid lest their arbitrary assertions should be overturned. Materials are not wanting, and many have undertaken the task, but a singular misfortune seems to hang over these things. In the earlier times this part of Roman topography was sadly bungled, even by most excellent men, and Nardini proceeded in quite a wrong way. He is one of those who, with great industry but insufficient learning, produced very little; he did not understand Greek, but helped himself by means of Latin translations, whence he often commits the strangest blunders. Notwithstanding his great diligence, he has not only produced bad and perverse results, but has done positive

[1] See, however, the *Beschreib. d. Stadt Rom*, iii. 1. p. 22, foll.

harm by making posterity acquiesce in his conclusions, for, until our own days, it was the prevalent opinion that he had settled every point, and people were satisfied with having read Nardini. Hence his work has been translated into Latin and incorporated in the "Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanorum." There were only few able men that were not misled by his authority, and ventured upon independent investigations after him, such as Ficoroni, though he entered only into special points. I knew at Rome a bookseller, a respectable and unassuming person, whose business was stopped for no other reason but because he had disregarded the authority of Nardini. Morelli, an excellent Italian, has written a treatise on the decay of scholarship in Italy, in which he makes a witty application of the scriptural expression, "Ablatum ab Israel, translatum ad gentes," telling his countrymen, that they have to learn their own antiquities from foreigners, and that philology in Italy is at an end. This is not indeed quite true, but the Italians are not sure in their own minds, they are often influenced by a certain feeling of uneasiness, and do not possess calm confidence. An honest inquirer need not despond; he does not mind owning that he has been mistaken, for who is exempt from it! Whoever makes great pretensions without having corresponding abilities, becomes unfaithful to truth, and will endeavour to crush and calumniate others, in order to preserve for himself dictatorial influence. Such is the case of Fea. Roman topography, as I have said before, was brought by Nardini to a stand still which lasted more than a century and a half. Zoëga too has made inquiries into it: being a Dane he is almost a countryman of mine, and I do not undervalue his learning; but if his works were written at the present time, the true scholars of Germany would not be a little surprised, for he was entirely deficient in real grammatical knowledge. He directed his mind and attention to things about which a healthy philology does not concern itself; such as the Egyptian mysteries and the like.

His reading was uncommonly extensive, but he had little scholarship, and owing to this he will be forgotten. He had examined the antiquities of Rome, and had read all the books upon them, but formed no sound conception of the ancient city. Nardini was quite aware that the Forum was the heart of Rome, both topographically and politically, but he unfortunately took an entirely wrong direction; instead of making the buildings succeed one another on the left, he makes them follow on the right, and puts in juxtaposition those which belong to different periods. Hence his confusion; his view of ancient Rome is altogether false. I have gained the right point of view in a peculiar way, and am quite certain of its correctness. I will relate the matter to you as an example of a thread in a labyrinth. Pliny states that, before sun-dials were known at Rome, the parts of the day, sunrise, noon, and sunset were cried out. But the Romans did not calculate according to the moment when the sun really set, but from the moment when the sun was no longer visible in the Forum. By this means it was determined as to whether an act had taken place at the right time or not, for the Romans were very exact in such trifles. Now in the Forum the sun became invisible about three minutes before the real sunset; the crier called out from the Curia, and at the different seasons of the year stated, when he had seen the sun. I have been on the spot innumerable times, and knew the district as well as I knew my own room; I sought the place where the Curia must have stood, and made experiments by watching the sun from that point at the different seasons of the year. By this means I obtained the advantage of certainty in regard to the whole side near the Palatine. Having once found the Curia Hostilia, I had at the same time the Comitium[1] and the Graecostasis. In a poem of Statius there occurs a description of the gigantic equestrian statue of Domitian, and the poet says that it looked towards the

[1] In one MS. the words "the Curia" are here added; is perhaps the Curia Julia meant?—Ed.

temple of Concord: the site of this statue I also succeeded in discovering. It then happened very fortunately that during an excavation an enormous cube was found, on which smaller cubes had been fastened bearing pillars: this was the identical pedestal of the equestrian statue of Domitian. It is clear, that its base consisted of bricks with a coating of marble; the masonry belongs to a period which a practised eye cannot mistake, and we may assert, that the great cubic block was built before the time of Severus, for afterwards the masonry became quite different. In the Monumentum Ancyranum of Augustus, the author, in speaking of a basilica, mentions that a temple of Castor was adjoining it; and this temple I discovered with the assistance of Statius. Its site is a subject of great difficulty, for according to the Monumentum Ancyranum, it was adjoining the basilica Julia, whereas it is commonly supposed to have been situated on the other side; but I knew from Ovid[1], that it was at the end of the Forum, and in this manner the whole Forum was made out.

Respecting the extent of the Roman Forum equally erroneous notions are current, because not only the district occupied by the ancient Forum, but the whole valley far and wide, up to the eminence from which the Via Sacra came down, has several times been covered with rubbish. This whole district is now called Campo Vaccino, and Andreas Fulvius and Bartholomaeus Marliani imagined that all this space, from the Capitol to the arch of Titus, was occupied by the Forum. People were the more tempted to assume this extent, as they entertained the most exaggerated notions about the population and magnitude of the city, as is the case, e.g., in Lipsius' book, "De Magnitudine Urbis Romae." He believes that Rome extended north as far as Civita Castellana, a distance of from thirty-five to forty English miles; for he imagined that the numbers of the census under the first emperors were those of the inhabitants of the city, whereas they embraced the whole body

[1] *Fast.* i. 707; some MSS. have Dionysius.—Ed.

of citizens, and accordingly amounted to millions. Nothing can be more senseless than what Lipsius has written on this subject; the exaggerations are enormous: sometimes he was misled by appearances, but sometimes he has not even this excuse. The Forum, in comparison with the present Campo Vaccino, was small, and in all our maps it is pushed too far towards the Capitol. It was situated between the Tarpeian and the Palatine, but did not occupy the whole length of the Capitoline; the triumphal arch of Septimius Severus stood beside, and not in, the Forum.

The first question here is as to the distinction between the Forum and the *Comitium*. In the earliest times they were as different as the populus was from the plebs: the Comitium being the place of assembly for the curiae (patricians), and the Forum the original market-place, in which, however, the plebeians met for the purpose of voting. The Comitium has been the subject of endless discussions and controversies, but most of the opinions about it are quite foolish. Things went so far that Nardini gained immense applause from the *imperiti* when he declared that the Comitium was the building of which three pillars are still standing: but these pillars belong to the Curia Julia. The Comitium was no building at all, it was nothing but an open place, and a part of the Forum in its wider sense. Both the Forum and the Comitium are parts of the same plain; at a later time the Comitium, in every-day language, was included in the word Forum, and there can be no doubt that the portico surrounding the Forum also inclosed the Comitium. The *rostra* formed the separation between the two. It is difficult to give you an accurate idea of the rostra, for we have no word conveying an adequate notion. Imagine a *suggestum* about twelve feet in breadth and at least thirty in length; imagine this to be of the height of a full-grown man, perhaps even somewhat higher, and on both sides steps leading up to it. I should never have been able to form a correct notion of it, had it not been for the fortunate accident, that just during my residence at Rome the new

rostra were excavated. No person recognised it or understood what it was; I was not inclined to enter into a dispute, but only took my friend, De Serre, the greatest orator of the present time, to see the spot, where if he had lived in ancient times, he would have achieved as great a reputation as any other. The inner kernel only remains, which is constructed of beautiful bricks and cement. The outside was probably, or I may say certainly, covered with marble, and the beaks of the ships (*rostra navium Antiatum* or *Antiatium*) were walled in in the front. So long as I had no correct notion of the rostra, I could not understand the meaning of the words *statuae in rostris positae;* it is only on such an extensive platform that they could be set up. Such a space is quite natural if we bear in mind the animated character of southern oratory, in which the speaker is in constant communication with those around him. One may still see this. There was at Rome a highly respectable monk who preached every Sunday, and during Lent, daily, in the Colosseum. He stood in the open air, and walked up and down as if he were conversing with his hearers. I think I never heard a sermon that made a deeper impression: sometimes he stood still, and sometimes he went from one to another of his hearers, without, however, calling any one by his name. It is this active communication with the audience that produced the *percussio laterum*; if a man, standing on a small platform, were to do this often, he would become ridiculous. At Athens, the case was different; the orators there did not move about so much, and the *βῆμα* seems to have been smaller; I have not indeed found any passage about it in the ancients, but I infer it from the locality; and according to the descriptions we have of it, it seems that it could not have been otherwise. Upon the rostra, at Rome, the statues stood *in loco aprico et conspicuo.* In the most ancient language, this platform was called *templum*, and the new name arose in 417, from the beaks of the ships, with which the front was adorned. I have often been on that spot, and often stood in

the Roman Forum: who will describe the emotions that rise in one's breast on a spot where Tiberius spoke upon Augustus, and other relations upon Germanicus (for these rostra are not the most ancient), where all the funeral orations upon the emperors were delivered, and where all great solemnities took place! And how wretched, how bare, and how stripped is that spot of all its splendour! Before you, you have Rome and its most ancient monuments, the carcer of Ancus Marcius; on the other side, the place once occupied by the temple of Concord, which Camillus built after having appeased the plebs: the lacus Servilius, where in the days of Sulla the heads of the proscribed were stuck up; the site of the temples of Castor and Vesta, and the Capitoline district: to such a place one can always return with a feeling of reverence; there one may imbibe the inspiration for writing the history of ancient times, and there one becomes familiar with it. The most ancient rostra were, no doubt, constructed of peperino. According to Plutarch, C. Gracchus transferred the real sovereignty to the people, by turning towards the Forum and the commonalty, instead of facing the Comitium where the patricians and the senate stood. Until then it had been customary for the orator, even when communicating something to the plebeians, to turn towards the patricians: but Gracchus turned round, and thus symbolically threw off the mask which he had worn until then. The present level of the Forum is about twenty-five or twenty-six feet higher than in ancient times.

The *Curia Hostilia* was situated on the πρόπους of the Palatine, just opposite the narrow side of the rostra. Its name is no doubt derived from Tullus Hostilius, who is certainly an historical personage; but we ought not to assert that he reigned from A. U. 78 till 110, for no one can know when he lived. This Curia existed down to the time of Cicero, when the populace led on by Sext. Clodius, carried into it the body of P. Clodius, who had been killed by Milo, and, in burning the corpse, reduced the building to ashes. Even

Sulla had made some alterations in the district around the rostra, but we do not know in what they consisted. The Curia was not restored on the ancient site, but farther to the right; Caesar commenced the new building, and Augustus completed it: this is the *Curia Julia*, near which the new rostra were constructed. The three splendid Corinthian columns which are still standing, belong to this Curia Julia; they stand parallel to the ridge of the Palatine and the line of the Capitoline, and are generally considered to have belonged to the temple of Jupiter Stator, while Fea believes them to be remnants of the temple of Castor. This latter hypothesis is impossible, for we read in Suetonius[1] that the arch of Caligula extended over the temple of Castor as far as the Capitol: but this is impossible, if the three columns belonged to the temple of Castor. They belong, I repeat it, to the Curia Julia; and this accounts for the fact that the rostra are found close by, and that the Capitoline Fasti, which formed one wall in that Curia, were found among its ruins. There can be no doubt that the very ancient plan of Rome,[2] which formed the floor of the church S. Cosma e Damiano, likewise belonged to it: there could not be a better place for it than one of the walls in the Curia Julia. The idea of Pirro Ligorio, that the Fasti were set up in an arch, is as improbable as many others of his views; attempts have been made to justify him, but he has evidently been guilty of many falsehoods. Notwithstanding this, however, his papers ought not to be neglected; they are preserved partly in the Vatican and partly among the manuscripts at Turin.[3] Rome, accordingly, had two Curiae, the Hostilia and Julia, which, however, did not exist at any time simultaneously; but the two rostra, the *vetera* and the *nova* or *Julia*, both existed at

[1] *Calig.* 22. I owe this reference to the kindness of Professor Urlichs, who further observes: "Niebuhr was thinking of this passage, and combines two facts contained in it, for Suetonius does not expressly say, that the arch built by Caligula passed over the temple of Castor."—Ed.

[2] Bunsen in the *Beschreib. der Stadt Rom*, Pref. xl., iii. 2. p. 33.—Ed.

[3] Compare Bunsen, *l. c.* Pref. p. xxiix.—Ed.

the same time. The *nova rostra* were built on the site of the ancient Curia.

The whole of the Forum was surrounded by a portico, which had been built either in the time of the kings or at the commencement of the republic; the columns were undoubtedly Etruscan, that is, old Doric, and the whole was made of peperino, covered with stucco, and not high. The booths (*tabernae* or *mensae argentariorum*), the stalls of money-changers or bankers, were set up in this portico to be protected against the weather. The armour taken from an enemy after a glorious victory was hung upon the pillars, whence the expression *postes ornare tropaeis* in one of the fragments of Ennius. Whether these trophies were carefully preserved, is unknown; but the old ones probably made room for new ones, though many a splendid memorial may have been seen there for a long time. In the Forum, below the Capitol, but beyond the clivus, were the temples of Saturn and Concord; further, when you look southward, having the Capitoline on the right and the Palatine on the left, you have on your right-hand side the temple of Castor, which was dedicated by the dictator A. Postumius; near it was the well of Juturna, in which the Dioscuri, after the battle of lake Regillus, washed their horses; next to it was the temple of Vesta, of which remains would certainly be found, if excavations were made; distinct mention of it is made in books written as late as the fifteenth century. On the opposite side was situated the Regia and the Atrium Vestae, which ought not to be confounded with the temple of that goddess. Rome contained many Atria, that is, open square spaces surrounded by houses and a portico, under which people walked in rainy weather. Such was the Atrium Libertatis, a kind of *bourse;* the most correct Latin name for a *bourse* or exchange accordingly would be *atrium negotiatorum* or *mercatorum.* The Atrium Vestae must have been like the cloisters of a monastery, the cells of the Vestals being built around a square; the priestesses moreover were buried beside the Atrium, as they had the privilege of

being buried within the city. This circumstance has caused great confusion in the antiquities of Rome, for when in the sixteenth century the church of S. Maria Liberatrice was erected on the left-hand side of the Atrium Vestae, and a number of tomb-stones of Vestal virgins were found there, it was inferred at once that this must be the site of the temple of Vesta. But this is opposed to all the statements of the ancients. I think it was one of my friends who had the happy idea that the temple ought not to be sought near the Atrium; I had previously said, that I could not believe the temple to have been there, and that, from all accounts, I must infer that it stood on the opposite side, not far from the lacus Curtius.

The Forum contained yet another class of buildings; it certainly was a market-place as well as a place for assembling; but in ancient times it was also the place for the administration of justice. In like manner, our own ancestors met under the open sky, and the estates of Lüneburg, as late as 1660, assembled in a forest, because decrees formed in a covered building were considered invalid. Such also was the case at Rome, all business was transacted in the open air. This is the native and natural custom of Italy: man there feels the necessity of living and doing his work under the free canopy of heaven; every artizan, if the weather permits it, works in front of his house where he has his shop. There still exist at Rome a great many houses built in exactly the same style as in the most ancient times. These shops have no windows, but are closed by means of a large door; and in bad weather the people take refuge within and work by candle-light; when the weather becomes fine again, they resume their seats in the door or in the street. Such also was the case with the ancients. Those who worked with their minds, had similar arrangements: during the night they remained in their rooms, but in the day-time they walked out into the open air, to some public place where they dictated or wrote. The air at Rome is very good, if we consider the dress of the ancients, which

consisted of wool, over which they wore the toga; the climate is more healthy than ours, and old age there commences later than with us. Justice, as I said before, was administered in the Forum in the open air; but as this was not without its disadvantages, it became necessary to devise some protection against them. When the Romans had become acquainted with Greece, they were much pleased with the στοὰ βασίλειος at Athens, and the idea of building *basilicae* suggested itself to them. The Stoa at Athens was probably a portico composed of several rows (we do not know how long these rows were), and afforded both sufficient light and protection in bad weather. When, therefore, an active intercourse between Rome and Greece had arisen, the Romans built such basilicae as courts of justice. They are by no means imitations of royal palaces of the East. Later Greeks, e. g., Agathias, always translate the word basilicae, whether at Rome or at Constantinople, by στοὰ βασίλειος. We must conceive that originally they were mere rows of columns supporting a roof, and without side-walls. They generally had six rows of columns in front, so that there were five entrances. Afterwards the two extreme rows, the first and sixth, were changed into walls; the back part also was walled up, and the tribunal for the presiding praetor was set up in a crescent formed in this back wall. This is the origin of the closed buildings called basilicae. As they were well adapted for public meetings, they became, ever since the time of Constantine, the regular types of Christian churches. What was the construction of churches before the time of Constantine, is a question which we cannot answer; we do not possess the slightest allusion to it. An immense number of fables are current respecting churches said to have been built by Constantine, but the only one which he really did build, is still known; it is the church of the Lateran, justly called *princeps ecclesiarum urbis et orbis*. The day on which that church was consecrated by Constantine, is quite certain, and is celebrated every year, I believe about the end of November. The

import of this festival of the consecration of the Church has at Rome itself been completely forgotten, and there is not one canon of the Lateran who knows it. I have learned it from an old Flemish gentleman, who, among much that was strange, also possessed a good deal of interesting information. The form of the basilicae, as I have described it, is very ancient, and in the Christian churches it is quite simple: all have five gates, and in the interior, four rows of columns, the two inner ones high, and the outer ones lower. This change, however, was not a matter of necessity. From this form I recognised the *basilica C. et L. Caesarum*, *Julia*, or *Caesaris* in what is commonly called the temple of Concord.

In the course of time the Forum became quite filled with basilicae, monuments, statues, and the like; it contained three or four basilicae, the Opimia, Porcia, Paulli, etc. Caesar set up a number of statues, so that during the latter period of the republic there was little space left for public assemblies, which, however, even without this, were rarely held; the idea of a free space must in the end have been entirely forgotten, and the comitium alone preserved this character. About sixty years ago, the pavement of the Comitium consisting of slabs of the most beautiful yellow Numidian marble, was discovered, but it was broken to pieces and sold in a disgraceful manner. In later times all the edifices were rebuilt, and the portico was restored with far more splendour (we know this from Orosius) and floored with magnificent stones, while the roof was of bronze and no doubt gilt.

This may suffice in regard to the Forum Romanum or Maximum. The word Forum originally, as is stated by the ancient lexicographers, signified "hollow ground;" but afterwards it assumed the same meaning as *ἀγορά*, and thus presupposes an open space. In later times the meaning underwent so strange a change, that the Fora, e.g., the Forum Ulpium or Trajani, were not open spaces at all, but places wholly covered with buildings. Of the same kind were the Fora of Nerva and Domitian. The same

must be supposed to have been the case even with the Forum of Caesar; in regard to that of Augustus, it may appear doubtful, as to whether a portion of it was not an open space. This change arose from the fact, that the idea of a free space, in the case of the Forum Maximum, was entirely lost sight of, and a Forum was regarded as a place containing courts of justice.

As, therefore, the ancient Forum was already filled with basilicae, Caesar, wishing to build a handsome one, erected it in a separate locality, which he purchased by the side of the Forum. This is the *Forum Caesaris*, which was not an open space at all, but a basilica with the temple of Venus Genitrix. It was situated at the foot of the Palatine, by the side of the Forum Maximum, its southern part turning towards the Vicus Tuscus, opposite the temple of Castor, as I have ascertained beyond a doubt. I cannot give you the proofs, because I have neither maps nor plans at hand.

The next *Forum* planned in the same manner is that of *Augustus*, except that a portion of it was probably an open space. It was situated at some distance from the Roman Forum, beyond the Via Sacra and, perhaps, a few more streets. Hirt, who is himself not rich in ideas, but in Roman topography has often successfully revived those of earlier writers (such as Palladio and Serlio), has demonstrated the site of this Forum. He is not a learned man, but has a well practised eye in observing antiquities; none of his own original views are good, but among the things he finds in earlier authors, he can well distinguish what is correct from what is not, a thing which learned men often cannot. The Forum of Augustus contained the temple of Mars Ultor, where the standards of Crassus, recovered from the Parthians, were set up, and also a magnificent basilica; there also stood—it was a noble conception—the statues of the most illustrious Romans, which had formerly stood in the market-place and in the orchestra of the theatre, with the *tituli gestorum*. A fragment of the latter is still extant fastened in a wall of the Vatican; but it is not even possible

to see whose name is mentioned in it. The writing certainly belongs to the age of Augustus, as every one can see who has an eye for such things. I cannot be mistaken in such a matter, I can immediately see whether an inscription was cut before the time of Caesar or in the age of Augustus. Such things make a residence at Rome so pleasing, when on seeing monuments one can immediately determine to what period they belong. The inscriptions, however, are still extant in copies, as for instance, at Pesaro. About a Roman mile from Tivoli, I found an overturned pedestal of a statue of Plancus, with an inscription, which had been quite rudely cut by a common mason, probably an ignorant slave. I was not able to convince a native of Tivoli, who even wrote on the antiquities of his own town, that such inscriptions are genuine.

The Forum Augusti is now foolishly called Forum Nervae, probably because it is situated near the latter; while down to the seventeenth century its ruins were regarded as part of the Forum Trajani. The *Forum Nervae* was very easy to be recognised by a temple built by Nerva and dedicated by Trajan, but the ruins of it were formerly believed to belong to the temple of Mars Ultor. Among these ruins there were six or eight columns, which unfortunately were lying on the ground, in consequence of which they were cut in pieces by Pope Paul V., who made use of the beautiful marble in building an aqueduct (*Acqua Paola*). This circumstance was so quickly forgotten that Nardini, who wrote only about forty or fifty years later, was perfectly ignorant of a temple having ever stood there, and that after him no modern ever even thought of it. All that was known of this temple of Nerva, was transferred to that of Mars Ultor. I discovered this fact from the work of Gamucci, an author of the sixteenth century, who gives a minute account of it, and representations of the ruins in woodcuts. I saw that three columns of exquisite beauty, which were generally referred to the temple of Mars Ultor, could be no other than those which he assigned to the Forum

of Trajan. I also found copper-plate engravings of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and made out quite clearly, that those columns were not what they were believed to be, and that the space of the Forum Nervae was covered with houses by Cardinal Alessandrini, under Paul V.

By the side of the Forum Augusti, another was built by Domitian, which was called *Forum Nervae* or *Palladium*, because he erected a temple of Pallas in it; architraves and disfigured columns (*colonnacce*) of it still exist. The Palladium is also seen represented in reliefs. But Domitian's name, as I have already observed, being detested by posterity, it afterwards obtained the name of Forum Nervae, for Nerva dedicated the temple of which the building had been commenced by Domitian.

The most magnificent of all the Fora was the *Forum Ulpium*, between the Capitoline and Quirinal, a whole complex of buildings, the splendour of which was unequalled by anything; as is seen even from the trifling remains which have escaped destruction during the middle ages. Its centre was adorned with the column of Trajan which made the destructiveness of the barbarians quail. By barbarians, I do not mean the Germans, for Goths and Vandals did not destroy buildings, but I allude to the feudalism of the middle ages, when all strong buildings were occupied as fortresses. Thus the senator Brancaleone knew no more expeditious way than to raze to the ground one hundred and forty ancient edifices, because they had been used as fortresses: such things happened at the time of the emperor Frederick II.[1], and if it were not for this barbarism the buildings might be still standing. The marble was used as lime, as was done even at the time when I lived in Rome, for an ancient street was then broken down for the convenience of a high road, and specimens of the most beautiful architecture were burnt down at Ostia into lime.

In regard to the name Forum Ulpium, you must remem-

[1] More accurately in 1257; comp. *Beschreib. d. Stadt. Rom*, i. p. 247. —Ed.

ber that adjectives of gentile names were taken, without change, from the primary adjective form, provided they applied to architectural works, whence *Forum Ulpium* and not *Ulpianum*, *Curia Julia* and not *Juliana*; when applied to writings and other works, however, the adjectives take the ending *anus*, as *orationes Tullianae*. Near the gigantic column of Trajan there were two basilicae of immense magnitude, and also two other large buildings, one of which, at least, contained a library. Statues of the most illustrious men were then set up in these basilicae, as they had formerly been in the Forum Augusti; this was the greatest honour that could be shown to a man, and the custom was preserved down to the latest times of the empire; the statues of Merobaudes, Sidonius Apollinaris, Claudian, and others, were found among the ruins of those basilicae. I recommend you to read Sidonius Apollinaris; I will not set up my authority in this matter as of much value, but J. M. Gesner calls Sidonius Apollinaris a *vir magnus*, although he is an incorrect writer. But he is a man of such genius and talent, that his equal is not easily to be met with in the course of centuries. He has something that reminds one of modern French authors; but in regard to his mind, he is thoroughly an ancient of the time when the night of barbarism was threatening to sink down upon mankind.

These are the real Fora. There can be no doubt, that the basilica of Antoninus Pius stood in the Piazza Colonna, where the façade of the columns is still preserved. What a pity that everything is now so much destroyed! for as late as the sixteenth century, there still existed in that place the pedestals of a number of allegorical statues representing the Roman provinces; some of them have been recovered though not recognised, but most of them have disappeared. I have not seen one of them, and have read only the notice that some have been found. Provincial coins of Antoninus Pius also exist showing on the one side the emperor's head, and on the other the name of a province, as Gallia, Bithynia, etc. That locality therefore seems to

have been the *Forum Aurelium*, which, however, is not mentioned in the Regionaria, because it was outside the city.

Besides these, Rome had yet a different kind of Fora, which were real market-places, for those I have hitherto mentioned are only the splendid ones. Two of these market-places belong to the period of ancient Rome, viz., the *Forum Boarium* towards the Circus, and the *Forum Olitorium* between the Capitoline and the Tiber, in the neighbourhood of the theatre of Marcellus, where I lived for six years. The Forum Boarium was no doubt a cattle market, where live cattle were sold, although we have no distinct statement to prove this; the Forum Olitorium was of course a vegetable market. Meat, however, was not sold in the Forum Boarium, but in the *macellum* which contained the butchers' stalls. In Greece, butchers' shops were unknown; people there ate so little meat, that it was never bought or sold in the market at Athens; for they ate meat only when they themselves killed an animal, that is, when they sacrificed. On such an occasion an entertainment was given on account of the meat, whence θύειν is synonymous with "to give an entertainment." Otherwise both the rich and poor at Athens lived as frugally as the modern Greeks on anchovies, the tunny fish, salt fish, salad, fruit, and olives; many a man in easy circumstances ate nothing all day except some olives with bread and without sitting down to a regular meal. This is the λιτὴ τράπεζα Ἀττικὴ mentioned by Athenaeus as opposed to Macedonian luxury. The Roman mode of living, on the other hand, was very like our own; the Romans took a great deal of meat, especially ham, like the German peasantry, bacon and other salt meat; they did not require a sacrifice to feast their friends. One of their principal dishes was a kind of porridge made of spelt; it is a very excellent dish and affords most healthy nourishment. For children, I know nothing better than this porridge with milk, on which I have brought up my own. There can be no doubt that oxen were sold in the

Forum Boarium, though there is a statement that it derived its name from a brazen bull which stood there.

There are a few other names in Roman topography which may be easily mistaken. One of them is *vicus*. Many years ago, before I had gone to Rome, a gentleman engaged in archaeological studies said to me, that it was utterly impossible to define what *vicus* meant. If by this he meant to say, that a vast deal had been written about it without making the matter clearer, he was quite right. But the cause of this was the base of a statue belonging to the period of the first emperors.[1] Each region of Augustus was subdivided into *vici*, which means nothing else but a quarter or district under the superintendence of its own police officer. Even at a much earlier time the regions of Servius Tullius had been similarly subdivided, in the city into *vici*, and in the country into *pagi*, and each had its own *magister*. The word *vicus* may be rendered by the German *Wik*, or *Wich*; in ancient times, many towns in lower Saxony were divided into *Wiks*. Now as it happened by accident that sometimes a single street constituted such a vicus, and as of course the houses on both sides of the street belonged to it, such a street was naturally called a vicus, as, for example, the *vicus Sceleratus*. The *vicus Patricius* and the *vicus Cornelius*, on the other hand, are obviously larger districts in the regio Collina and Esquilina. I think (I may be mistaken, but I believe I am right) that in the Regionaria every region of Augustus was regularly divided into seven vici. Many a street at Rome is called *vico* to this day, and a narrow lane is called *vicolo*, which, however, is only a secondary meaning.

The word *platea* is likewise one of those which may mislead, and of which only vague notions are current. The general opinion, I believe, is, that platea signifies a broad street on account of its derivation from the Greek πλατεῖα;

[1] The so-called *Basis Capitolina*, Gruter, *Inscript.* CCL., reprinted in Becker's *Handbuch d. Röm. Alterthümer*, vol.i. p.717; compare Bunsen in the *Beschreib. d. Stadt Rom*, vol.i. p.174.—ED.

but it is something else; it is what we call *place* or *piazza*. In the early times of Rome the name does not seem to have been used; it occurs only at a later period, when an intercourse was established with Greece. We have to understand by it a wide open space, such as we have in front of many large buildings; but not a market-place. The authority which has enabled me to establish this as the real meaning of the word, shows how necessary it is for an historical philologer not to limit his reading: for I know it from several passages of St. Augustin's work, "De Civitate Dei." St. Augustin, one of the greatest minds, ought to be recommended on account of his intellect, and independently of any historical information which his works may furnish; his genius is a mighty one, and was extremely developed in that agitated period, which forms the boundary line between the ancient and modern world. In his account of the conquest of Rome by the Goths, which he gives merely in passing, there are passages from which it is quite evident that *platea* is a space such as I have described before. These are generally speaking, the only open spaces which Rome, after its rebuilding since the middle ages, now possesses, as, for example, the Piazza di Spagna below the Collis Hortulorum; a large place of the size of the market-place of Bonn is scarcely to be found at Rome.

The first *aqueduct* was built by Appius Caecus during the second Samnite war; it was very low, and for the most part under ground. It led to the Aventine, and was intended to provide a supply of good water to the districts between that hill and the Tiber, which had scarcely any water but that of the river. Water is still derived in one place, and I believe even in two, from this aqueduct, without most people being aware of it. It was built under ground, because the enemies sometimes advanced to the very neighbourhood of Rome, and might, therefore, easily have cut off the supply of water. Afterwards the number of aqueducts at Rome rose to fourteen. Fresh water

is a real blessing to the inhabitants of the south; one must have lived there in order to comprehend that these aqueducts were not a matter of luxury. The *Aqua Marcia* led to the Capitol; of the *Aqua Virgo* (now Acqua di Trevi) a large *specus* is still visible. The greatest aqueduct was that of the emperor Claudius, which was preserved as late as the eighth century of the Christian era; it might easily have been restored; its arches were taken down gradually after the restoration of Rome in the sixteenth century, because people wanted the bricks to build their houses.

Rome had two great *Circuses* which were destined for races, for these were the national games of the Romans from the earliest times. The most ancient, the *ludi magni Romani*, which were traced back to the time of Tarquinius Priscus, were established for the patrician burgesses; but besides these there existed, likewise, from very ancient times, *ludi plebeii*, a very remarkable instance of the manner in which in all Roman institutions the populus and the plebs stood by the side of each other. Down to the latest period, these two kinds of games were never held in the same place. In the early times the plebeians had no share whatever in the *ludi Romani*. In the Circus Maximus the places were assigned to the populus according to curiae, *ad spectacula facienda*,[1] as scaffoldings are still erected on both sides of the Corso at the time of the races. The *Circus Maximus* may have had its present extent from the very first, for it could not be very small on account of the chariot races, but it was not as high as afterwards. A greater height became necessary when, instead of the small number of the populus and their clients, the whole Roman people took part in the spectacle; the plebeians may indeed not have been excluded in the early times, but they had no places assigned to them. This Circus between the Palatine and Aventine cannot have been laid out before the building of the Cloacae, and the carrying through of the Marrana, since previously the whole was a marsh. At present the sewers must be blocked up, for

[1] Livy, i. 35.

in digging to the depth of a few feet nothing but morass and marshy ground appears. The splendid obelisk which now stands before the church of the Lateran, was dug out there as late as the sixteenth century: and there can be no doubt that valuable treasures of art are still buried there. The Circus occupied the whole length of the valley, now la Via de' Cerci. That form of it, of which we have a description, was planned and undertaken by Caesar, and probably completed by Augustus, for it is inconceivable that the short duration of Caesar's dictatorship should have sufficed for it. It is said to have contained room for 300,000 men, the seats rising in terraces above one another as in the Colosseum. On the outside, it presented rows of porticoes one above the other, the lowest one being occupied by shops or stalls. In the middle ages, the Circus Maximus was used as a fortress.

The *Circus Flaminius* must have been the place for the plebeian games: the plebs met for its deliberations and elections on the place of the *prata Flaminia* even before the Circus was built, when after the abolition of the decemvirate the ancient order of things was restored; whence the locality appears to have been essentially plebeian. The traces of this Circus, which can still be recognised, are somewhat more numerous than those of the Circus Maximus, although here, too, every thing is built over; the ancient walls have been used as foundations only in cellars and a few houses, whence the houses there are built in a curve or crescent. In the middle ages, this Circus was used as a place for rope making, whence the church in that part is called *S. Catarina de' funari.*

These two Circuses were destined for chariot races, as the *Circus Agonalis* was for Greek games or contests. This latter Circus was situated on the place now called Piazza Navona. It was built by Alexander Severus, in the form of a Greek Stadium, which was in reality not very different from that of a Roman Circus. All the houses there have the strong ancient walls for their foundations, whence the

form of the Circus is preserved, whereas in the case of the Circus Flaminius it is lost, buildings having been erected right across it.

Theatres, in the Greek sense of the term, were not numerous at Rome. In early times there even existed a censorial interdict forbidding the erection of a permanent theatre for plays; and when about the end of the sixth century an attempt was made to break through this regulation, the censors ordered a theatre, which had been built, to be pulled down. This was a terrible piece of pedantry, and a scrupulous adherence to ancient customs for which there was no good reason at all. Plays, therefore, were performed before the people in the Circus or in the Forum on temporary stages, which were erected with the greatest extravagance; the aediles were obliged to give spectacles in order to gain popularity, and the actors had to be paid. Subsequently the first and almost only theatre was built by Augustus, and called after young Marcellus, his sister's son. Pompey had indeed erected a theatre a few years before, but it does not appear to have been kept for the purpose for which it was built. About one-third of the theatre of Marcellus became the property of the house of Savelli, who made it a fortress; it was then pulled down and rebuilt as a palace. When the family of the Savelli became impoverished, the palace passed into the hands of the Orsini. I have lived in it for six years, and know every corner of it well: the Doric story below and the Ionic above still exist, but upon them enormous blocks of stone and rubbish are accumulated; the cellars still exist with their vaults and are inhabited. By the side of it there is an immense mound of rubbish, and close by my residence seventy-two steps led up to a garden, which is at the top. The house contains rooms built in the ancient fashion of about the end of the sixteenth century.

The idea of *amphitheatres* arose in Italy at an early period. Until then, all gymnastic games, and even the contests of gladiators and wild beasts (of which the humane Greeks

knew nothing) were held in the same locality in which also the more national chariot-races and the Hellenic games took place, that is, in the Circus. But this was connected with great disadvantages and inconveniences: the form of the Circus was very well adapted to races, for in them it made no difference where a person sat, whether at the beginning or at the end of the course, for the starting as well as the arrival at the goal had its interest for the connoisseur. But when a contest took place on a definite spot, the immense length of the Circus rendered it a matter of importance as to where a person sat. The Circus can scarcely be said to have formed an ellipsis, it was in reality an irregular figure, which cannot be described with mathematical precision, the length being disproportionately great in comparison with the breadth. The idea then occurred to the Romans to supply in some measure the place of a Greek theatre by combining two theatres in the form of an ellipsis, so that persons could see round the whole building, a thing for which the Greeks had no occasion. This combination produced the amphitheatres, which were not built at Rome before the time of Caesar. That they are a late invention is clear from the fact, that, in all the provincial towns of Italy, they are, without exception, not within the walls, but outside of them. This observation has not yet been made by any one; and I believe I was led to it by Lami, the excellent dean of Florence, though I may have made it without any hint. At Rome, too, the amphitheatres were not within the ancient city; the *amphitheatrum Flavium* alone (the Colosseum, now called Coliseum), which was built by Vespasian, was situated close to the Velia, and required the purchase of a whole district. The amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus was situated by the river-side, where enormous ruins still exist, and where the family of the Cenci has a palace.

The amphitheatres, moreover, do not belong to the ancient kind of architecture, but show their late origin also by a somewhat different style. Imagine the amphitheatre inter-

sected and composed of a large number of segments, which are broad at the periphery but narrow the towards interior, running in the direction of an acute angle: the interior is on all sides surrounded by these segments. Between them are steps, by which, from the interior, persons reached their seats; the steps are high, though not too much so, and lead to the different terraces. At present a person may get down even without these steps, but it is necessary to leap from bench to bench. Great as is the perfection of ancient buildings, yet their stairs were essentially bad, the steps being too narrow and too high, which arose from a desire to save space. The segments separated by the steps were called *cunei*; the interior, or the real scene, bore the name of *arena*. In some amphitheatres, the arena consisted of a permanent and solid floor, whereas in others, as, for example, in the Colosseum, the floor was not fixed: several walls traversed it in different directions, so that boards covered with sand could be laid upon them, in order to absorb the blood of the gladiators: hence the name arena. After an exhibition the boards were taken away, and renewed at the next. Sometimes water was let in or trees were planted in the ground, so that the place of the arena presented the appearance of a forest: in short, a thousand artifices were contrived. It is a circumstance which must be borne in mind, that the arena, at least in the Colosseum and probably in all the larger amphitheatres of all great cities also, was moveable. Next to the arena was the first place for persons of rank, and in front of this first row of seats there was a canal full of water and steep embankments to prevent the animals rushing among the spectators. In addition to this, iron spikes were planted before the first seat, so that even if a wild beast had leapt across the canal, it would have run itself through with the pointed irons. This first row of seats, which went all round, was called *podium*, a word which, besides this technical application, occurs only in the middle ages and in the languages derived from the Latin, in the sense of "a hill" (Italian, *poggio*;

Catalonian, *puig*; Provençal, *puy*, as also in *Puycerda*, hill of Cerda). This row contained the seats of the emperor and the imperial family, of the nobles and the senators, for it was spacious enough to afford room for the whole senate. We can still with tolerable certainty determine the place containing the imperial box.

These are the most essential points in the structure of an amphitheatre. Many things connected with the arrangements, however, still remain obscure, and the lower part of the Colosseum has not yet been sufficiently excavated. It is, for example, still uncertain in what manner it was contrived to introduce the wild beasts into the arena. All the explanations which have been proposed are unsatisfactory. Excavations have indeed been made, but have been discontinued partly from a fear of weakening the building, which point certainly is not to be overlooked, on account of the many earthquakes, and partly on account of erroneous suppositions, because people could not understand that the arena was moveable. Another reason why the excavations are not continued, is the belief that at one time there was an altar in the arena, and that, accordingly the ground is sacred through the blood of the martyrs. Such perverse notions are obstacles to the discovery of truth.

Another amphitheatre, the *amphitheatrum castrense*, was close to the wall; Procopius calls it *Vivarium*.

I shall now proceed to speak of the *thermae*. Public baths existed at Rome from the earliest times. Southern countries really require them, and they were universally used until late in the middle ages. Under Gregory I., one of the greatest and most excellent men of his period, whose government was distinguished for its beneficial measures, though he did not reign as a sovereign, Rome was already quite deserted; still, from one of his letters, I have learned that the use of baths was then quite common. Pope Hadrian I.,[1] likewise a very great man, restored the Aqua

[1] "We still want a political history of Rome, which would show that a very great deal that is praiseworthy is to be said of many a pope."

Claudia, which had been neglected, for the purpose of supplying the baths with water. Gregory I. states, that in his time many people considered it sinful to bathe on a Sunday; but he himself, who was more clear-sighted than his flock, issued a proclamation[1] advising the people not to be so foolish as to allow themselves to be prevented by such a prejudice. This is a proof that baths were then still in general use. In Germany, too, they were more common in the middle ages than they are now. Such *balnea* or *balneae* were very popular in ancient Rome even before the manners of the Greeks had commenced exercising their influence. *Thermae* (*θερμαί*) were first built under Augustus; but we must not infer from this, that previously people bathed in cold water in the city, for whenever they wished to do this, they plunged into the Tiber. I explain the name *thermae* in the following manner:—It had become customary at Baiae and other watering places to combine warm baths with the use of the mineral waters and with sea-bathing: the life in those places was like that in our watering-places: people frequented them for the purpose of diverting their minds and taking care of their bodies. Greeks (commonly called *Graeculi*) were not wanting to provide amusements of every description with the same industry which Italians and Frenchmen display in German watering-places. People there threw off all cares and put aside every kind of work, whence the Roman nobles repaired to such places every spring. This, however, required a large fortune, for those who had to maintain themselves by their own industry could not afford to go to Baiae and stay there for a month. For this reason, Augustus and Agrippa, whose object was to keep the great body of the population in comfort and good humour, built artificial baths as a place in the capital itself, where the people, without travelling to Baiae, might have similar enjoyments; just as at present mineral waters may be enjoyed at a great distance from the springs. To these places, then, every one who wished it, could go and

[1] Epist. xiii. 1.

take a bath; they contained sulphureous baths, vapour-baths, etc., and people might lounge there without the fatigue of a journey. The most magnificent buildings, most luxuriously furnished, were erected for this purpose: besides the bath-rooms, there were others, in which all kinds of amusements were provided, such as places for the games of the time, for games at ball, drafts, and the like, nay, even a library existed there, as at present newspapers are kept in the Cafés. They were accordingly, in reality, institutions to while away leisure hours in ease and comfort, and were peculiarly fitted to extinguish the mutinous spirit of the people, and to tame them by the enjoyments of life. These thermae became extremely popular, whence one emperor after another contributed one to the number already existing to prevent people being obliged to go to a distant part of the city, and to provide each quarter with its own. The thermae of Agrippa were outside the city, near the Campus Martius and the Pantheon, for he would not disturb any part of the city with his new institution: he took care, by irrigation, that everything was green in the Campus Martius during the summer, and near to the Pantheon he ordered avenues of trees to be planted. The thermae of Titus bear this name unjustly; the earlier antiquarians, even as late as the fifteenth century, called them thermae of Trajan; they existed in the Carinae and were of quite a monstrous extent. In the middle ages the building was called Curia Vecchia. The thermae of Caius and Lucius Caesar in the eastern part of the city are now quite foolishly called *templum Minervae Medicae*. The building which now bears this name, was nothing else than a large portico belonging to the Thermae. There also existed thermae of Nero, Titus, Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Alexander Severus (near those of Agrippa), Decius, Diocletian, and Constantine, so that we can scarcely understand how all these colossal buildings had room within the circumference of Rome. In these thermae some of the choicest specimens of ancient art have been

discovered; they contained excellent galleries of paintings, and the most beautiful statues were set up there in the most suitable places. If the group of the Laocoon were still standing in the thermae of Titus, where it originally stood, it would have a far more appropriate place than that which it occupies at present.

The *Palatine* was originally nothing but an inhabited district like the other hills. Cicero's house stood upon it, and coming from the Via Sacra, one may still approximately determine the spot where it stood. Augustus, too, lived on the Palatine, but only as a private person. Tiberius built another house for himself by the side of that of Augustus, and probably inhabited it before his accession. Caligula built a palace there in another part; but notwithstanding this, the whole of the Palatine was full of private dwelling-houses, and there was no other public building on it except temples. The conflagration under Nero destroyed all the buildings on this hill. Nero then erected a palace on the Palatine; but not satisfied with this, he continued it down to the Esquiliae and even up the Esquiliae. The so-called golden house was situated between the two hills, on a splendid spot, and extremely well chosen. But, at a later time, we see that the imperial palace occupied the whole of the Palatine. We must not imagine this to have been one homogeneous and regular building, constructed on one plan, with a large front, like our royal palaces. Nothing is more senseless than the restorations which the old Italian antiquarians, such as Bianchini and Panvini, have made of this golden house: the latter has drawn an outline of a building which never existed at all. It is only now that the eyes of antiquarians have been opened in regard to this subject. The whole of the Palatine hill is covered with ruins, which have raised its height. The lower part of the building is completely filled with earth; and if a person wishes to investigate it, he must break through the ground until he reaches these vaults. They are a real labyrinth; I have been successful

in many points of the topography of Rome, but I have not been able to form an idea of the imperial palace. The excavations which were made in 1724 extended only over a small part, but the *aula Domitiani* was then brought to light; the outlines of an enormous hall and splendid columns, partially preserved, belonged to this aula, and can easily be made out; but there is also a great number of I know not what kind of chambers: I can give you no information about them. It would be desirable to see systematic excavations made there. The whole district is the private property of the king of Naples, whence the pope cannot order excavations to be made; the ambassador of the king had permission to do so, but he was recalled from Rome. The palace must have existed as late as the middle ages, perhaps until the 11th or 12th century; it was then reduced to ashes, as is attested by the excavations, which have shown traces of a great conflagration. In a ritual of the coronation of the emperors belonging to the end of the 11th century, which has been printed from the original of Cencius Camerarius,[1] we read—"When the emperor is crowned in St. Peter, he and the empress proceed to the *palatium Romanum*, the emperor entering the apartment of Augustus, and the empress that of Livia." These apartments are correct and have been found, and the statement shows that they were inhabited. Some fifty years ago a French dealer in works of art made excavations there, on which occasion many things are said to have been found, but the place was pillaged in a most disgraceful manner. Traces of a magnificence appeared which surpass all our conceptions: the walls of the rooms were covered with silver plate, and large pieces of silver texture served as tapestry; in other palaces the walls were covered with ordinary tapestry (*aulaea*),

[1] Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. med. aevi*, i., p. 101; the passage here quoted occurs in p. 108; Pertz, *Monum. Germ. Legum*, ii., p. 187, who assigns this *Ordo Coronationis* to the year 1191; the book of Cencius, *Liber censuum Romanae Ecclesiae*, was written in 1192.—Ed.

but here silver was employed instead. The treasures among the ruins were so numerous, that even after the pillage some things still remained.

There are, properly speaking, only two streets in ancient Rome, which are known as such, namely, the *Via Sacra* and the *Subura*. The former began at the ridge, which extended from the Palatine to the Esquiliae, and was called *Velia*, known as the place where the house of P. Valerius Poplicola stood; from this Velia it ran across the Forum, and on the other side of the Palatine, the form of which is almost square, it turned towards the boundary line between the Roman and the Sabine town. We know from Varro, that in the language of ordinary life only the first part of the street, namely, that on the Velia, bore the name of Via Sacra. The buildings by which it was lined were by no means splendid; the houses which have been dug out are very small, and no person of rank lived there; but, at the same time, it was the street through which the processions passed, and there were a great many statues in it. The street, as I said before, began at the height; it passed between the temples of Venus and Peace, and had several triumphal arches. At the point where it touched the Forum there stood the *fornix Fabianus*. It is possible that it may have been the custom, even in early times, to make temporary arches of foliage on the occasion of a triumphal procession; but the first arch made of stone was that for the triumph of Q. Fabius Allobrogicus. The arches still existing are those of Titus, Septimius Severus, and that of Constantine, which is entirely composed of stolen basreliefs; but there were many more, as, for example, two of Trajan, one of Valentinian and another of Gratian. They stood in the street of the Ponte St. Angelo, and existed as late as the middle ages; their inscriptions are preserved in copies.

The *Subura* is still called by the same name. Nardini is quite mistaken in his assertion, that the ancient Subura was situated in a different locality, near the Lateran; no man in his senses can admit this, for it is opposed to all

our evidence. We even have the express testimony of Varro, that its site is identical with that of the present Subura, that is, in the plain north of the Esquiliae, whence it had the advantage of being completely built on both sides. In it stood the house of Caesar, and in the times of the republic the aristocracy generally lived there and in the Carinae on the Esquiline. Afterwards, in the time of emperors, a change took place in this respect, and every one removed to the new quarters, whence, in the days of Juvenal and Martial, the Subura was inhabited only by the lowest classes; at present, too, it is the abode of poverty. The *Carinae* were a quarter rather than a single street, in the district of S. Pietro in Vincola. After the great fire, Nero built a palace (not the golden house) there; and not far from it was the palace of Titus and the thermae of Trajan.

The Quirinal had no remarkable buildings; at a later period Aurelian erected there the temple of the Sun, the most gigantic building in all Rome, of which vast ruins still exist in the garden of the Colonna family. At that time there was a taste for everything gigantic, because architects were no longer able to produce the beautiful. The *Viminal*, too, contained nothing worth noticing. The Carinae, as I have already remarked, were on the *Esquiline*. Within the walls of Servius Tullius, I know of no particularly remarkable edifice belonging to the early period, though it contained a large number of small temples. The same must be said of the *Caelius* in its narrower sense; only one arch still exists there; in the middle ages it contained many buildings.

On the rugged side of the *Aventine*, towards the river, stood the temple of Diana, which, according to tradition, Servius Tullius had built as a point of union for the Romans and Latins, and in which the table containing the ancient treaty was preserved. On the same hill there existed the thermae of Decius and a number of other buildings. I have already observed, that the Porta Trige-

mina was on the Aventine towards the river. On the side of the Palatine towards the Aventine there was a flight of marble steps, called the *Scala Caci*; one tradition assigned it to the Palatine, and another to the Aventine, a discrepancy which probably arose from the opposition between the inhabitants of the two hills.

Having thus rapidly passed over the hills, I shall now proceed further. A *suburb* was first formed between the Palatine, Aventine, and Esquiline on the one side, and the Tiber on the other. I have already mentioned as a part of it the *Forum olitorium*, which was at the same time a fish-market, and still exists unchanged. The suburb became a thickly inhabited district, and in it Augustus built the theatre of Marcellus and the great portico of his sister Octavia.

Another suburb extended along the Tiber as far as Ponte Sisto at the great reach of the river, where the amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus was situated; it occupied the whole side of the river, which in our maps is erroneously called Campus Martius. We generally imagine that this Campus was the only one the Romans had; but this is a mistake, for Campi also existed in front of other hills and gates; and like the great Campus, they were gradually covered with houses, though they were neither as extensive nor as important as the Campus Martius. One of them was the *Campus Esquilinus*, in the plain before the Esquiline beyond the agger, and the *Campus Caelimontanus* at the foot of the Caelius (now the palace of the Lateran) was another. These two Campi are as clear as possible, and are frequently mentioned; their destination was the same as that of the Campus Martius, and when in consequence of inundations the games could not be held in the latter, they were transferred to the Caelimontanus or the Esquilinus. Both these Campi were national property. Ever since the time of Augustus, houses were built in the Campus Martius. It contained the well known *septa*, a place fenced round, in which the centuries voted; even Pompey had built his theatre on the very border of the

Campus; Agrippa erected his thermae there, and his incomparably more beautiful Pantheon; and Augustus had there his Mausoleum, from which an avenue of trees led to the buildings of Agrippa. Alexander Severus built there new thermae, a circus, and several triumphal arches, so that the Campus Martius entirely disappeared. In the second and third century Rome extended more and more in that direction, whence at present that part is thickly covered with houses. Of the buildings which are found there, I have already mentioned the thermae of Alexander Severus, the Circus Agonalis, and the structures of Agrippa, and I shall now say a few words about the *Mausoleum of Augustus*. This building formed a gigantic mass, and was as imperishable as the pyramids. The descriptions we have of it are very obscure, nor do its remains enable us to form an idea of it; the drawings of its remains, which were made in the sixteenth century, are very doubtful. A large basrelief may still have existed, also a water basin made of stone, which has disappeared in an unaccountable manner; but otherwise I believe that the drawings contain restorations. It is said that there was also a kind of suspended gardens with the soil artificially carried into them, but this may be founded on some misunderstanding.

The *mausoleum of Hadrian*, at present the Castel S. Angelo, was even a much larger structure. Its restoration, which we see in drawings, is anything but trustworthy; but there are drawings of the fifteenth century, in which a small portion, which was then still uninjured, is represented. At present we still see an immense pile impregnable and inaccessible, into which there was only one entrance like that of a cave, with a passage leading to the burial place. There Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Antoninus the philosopher were buried. Inscriptions about it are still found in the Itinerary of Einsiedeln, which belongs to the seventh or eighth century. This building was used as a fort at a very early period; Belisarius there defended himself against the Goths: the Roman garrison consisted of Huns who hurled the statues

32718

with which the building was adorned against the enemies. It is possible that the Barberini Faun was on that occasion thrown down, as it was found there at the time when Urban VIII. built the fortifications. During subsequent wars the Castel S. Angelo was often defended, as for example, when under Crescentius the city refused to surrender to Otho III. The greatest devastations took place in the fourteenth century, when the Romans, who were then little better than barbarians, wanted to level the whole structure with the ground, because it had occasioned them great annoyance: at that time many more inscriptions were preserved than at present. For weeks and months they laboured in tearing away the marble coating and the outward ornaments, but not being able to get through they gave it up at last. Pope Alexander VI. built some towers as means of defence, and on that occasion the destruction was carried still further. But after that time, three inscriptions still remained in the sixteenth century. The present condition, which is still imposing, is the work of Urban VIII. who made a regular fortress of it. In order to provide it with artillery, he caused the bronze of the vestibule of the Pantheon to be melted and eighty cannons to be made of it, which, during the French revolution, were carried by Murat to Naples. The costly sarcophagi of porphyry, which belonged to the mausoleum of Hadrian are dispersed; one of them still exists in the palace Borghese, and another, generally called the sarcophagus of Agrippa, probably also belonged to it. Trajan's ashes were contained in an urn which stood on his column. Hence the opinion that the gilt ball on the obelisk in front of the Circus contained the ashes of Augustus; but this is only an erroneous opinion of the middle ages; it was opened under Sixtus V. when the obelisk was removed, and nothing but dust was found in it; but how this dust had got into it, no one can tell, perhaps it was introduced by rain. It certainly was not the ashes of Augustus, for we know distinctly where Augustus and his family were buried. There still exists in the Capitol a

very simple coffin containing the remains of Agrippina; its side has the inscription *Ossa Agrippinae Germanici.* During an accidental excavation near San Carlo and the Corso, a *bustum* of the Caesars was discovered, on which their bodies were burnt; each imperial family had a distinct place for this purpose. At present several monumental stones of such *busta* exist in the Museo Pio-Clementino; they always have an inscription, such as *C. Caesar hic crematus est.* I believe there still exist half-a-dozen of such inscriptions.

Not far from the *molęs Hadriani* there was a third *Circus*, built by Nero, and by the side of it stands the church of St. Peter. According to a tradition, the iron gate, where the apostles Peter and Paul suffered the death of martyrs, still exists there; but according to others, Peter died on the Janiculus, the *mons aureus* of the middle ages. There, too, a suburb arose as early as the time of Justinian; the church of St. Peter attracted many inhabitants, and the place was especially occupied by Germans, Saxons, and Lombards, who went to Rome for devotional purposes, or were engaged in the service of the Praefectus to defend the pope. They had their quarters (*scholae*) there, whence the name *schola Saxonum*, and in the same district we have the Ospidale in Sassi. This suburb was surrounded with walls by Leo IV. and called *Burgus* (*Borgo*).

Trastevere, on the same side of the river, though separated by a great space, was a suburb as early as the time of Augustus; it now contains the oldest houses in Rome, which belong to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Augustus had gardens there, and during the republican period a *navale* existed there on the south of the Aventine. On the same bank of the river there was a *naumachia*, a district surrounded by a wall, which could be filled with water for mock-fights with small boats.

Ancient Rome had originally only one bridge, the *Pons Sublicius*; it consisted at first entirely of wood, and could be taken down for the purpose of defending the city against

the attacks of an enemy. This bridge remained for a long time the only one. The *Pons Milvius*, in the neighbourhood of Rome, was likewise very ancient, but was three Roman miles distant from the Porta Carmentalis. After the third Punic war, Scipio, as censor, built a second bridge (*Pons Palatinus*) across the Tiber. It was situated before the Velabrum, near to the Pons Sublicius, and between it and the island. Not a trace of the Pons Sublicius now exists. The Milvian bridge was at first likewise made of wood, and no doubt that of Scipio also. The latter remained throughout the middle ages until the sixteenth century. There have been hydrostatic disputes about this bridge, as to whether it was built flat against the current of the river or not; it does not, however, seem probable, that, if it had been constructed on a wrong principle, it should have existed for a period of 1700 years; we must rather suppose that during this long interval the Tiber changed its course. In the sixteenth century, when the river had retreated, the bridge broke down. I am of opinion that Cavaliere Linotte, who asserts this, is right, although he is not a man of learning: such investigations do not require much learning, and good common sense is often of greater assistance. In the same century, the bridge was restored, but twenty years later it broke down again; at present only a few arches of it exist, and the first, on the opposite bank, may be assumed with certainty to be the one that was built by Scipio. A poor woman had established a garden upon its ruins, and for the payment of a trifle I was allowed to go there as often as I liked.

The *island* which, according to tradition, was formed out of the corn thrown into the river after the expulsion of the Tarquins, is remarkable for the temple of Aesculapius. Even in very early times, and long before the age of Augustus, the incredibly tasteless attempt was made to give to that temple the form of a ship, in imitation of the vessel in which the god had been conveyed to Rome; it was built of travertine. During the middle ages a considerable part

of the temple still existed, as may be seen from a drawing of Boissard, which was made in the fourteenth century. Old people under Pius VI. still saw a great deal of it, but afterwards a large part of the wall was used for other purposes; in like manner a splendid part of the thermae of Titus was destroyed as late as 1796.

The island was connected with the mainland on both sides by the *Pons Cestius* and the *Pons Fabricius*, which were very ancient. Next came the *Pons Senatorius*, on the spot now occupied by the Ponte Sisto; *Pons Aelius* near S. Angelo, and the *Pons Milvius* outside the city, now Ponte Molle.

I shall now proceed to speak of

LATIUM

as the country of the Latins. We shall first take Latium Proper, then the coast from Antium to Terracina, which was originally a Tyrrhenian and afterwards a Volscian country, and lastly the country of the Hernicans. But I have previously to make some remarks about the port towns of Rome.

All rivers of any importance carrying sand or mud form a delta, their mouths being pushed forward by the tides or the nature of the seas. Down to a certain point, they flow in a straight line, and then divide into two arms, leaving a low sand-bank between them. Such are the deltas of the Po, the Mississipi, the Nile, and the Ganges. The Tiber forms a similar *πρόχωσις*, and the ridges of sand on both sides become more and more widely separated from each other. On the left arm, which accordingly must have existed as early as that time, king Ancus Marcius, who is no doubt an historical personage, built the town of *Ostia*. I believe I can prove that Ancus Marcius concluded a treaty

with the Latins, by which a number of the Latin towns, I mean those between Rome and the sea, were ceded to Rome, while other places remained united with Latium. In after times, Rome twice concluded similar treaties with Latium. Ostia was founded as a pure Roman colony, and became the port town of Rome. Afterwards it grew into a very large place, as is clear from the extensive and very splendid ruins. It was first destroyed in the war between Marius and Sulla, and afterwards frightfully devastated by the Vandals; in the ninth century it existed again, but was then destroyed by the Saracens. The great pope Leo IV. restored it, but the new town was not of long duration. At present the atmosphere is very unhealthy, which was not the case in the time of ancient Rome; whence we must infer, that then there were no marshes in the neighbourhood, for the poisonous air comes from the marshes. The district is at present so neglected that the place is completely deserted.

In the time of the Antonines, Ostia was the summer residence of the Romans, probably those of the middle classes, who had no large estates and could not afford to remain away from Rome for any great length of time. A very pleasing description of it occurs in the apologetic work of Minutius Felix, the scene of which is laid at Ostia. The Roman jurists spent their vacations there. The beauty and wealth of the place at that time form a remarkable contrast with its present condition, for scarcely any persons but criminals live there; for a long time past Ostia has been a sort of asylum, where murderers are safe against the danger of being seized by the police. This is one of the most fearful changes: the country round it is an immense swamp inhabited by buffalos.

In the reign of Claudius an artificial port was formed on the right arm of the Tiber, which was deeper, the course of the river having been regulated. Trajan extended the port, and this *Portus Romanus* now became the real sea-port of

Rome, a depôt for the immense supplies required for the city. At present, too, the little maritime commerce of the Romans is carried on along the right bank of the Tiber.

I will not mention all the places of ancient Latium which happen to be once noticed by ancient writers, many of them are mere names of destroyed places; much more might indeed be made out than has yet been done, but the advantages would not be very considerable. We must conceive Latium in the earlier times to have been divided into three parts: 1. *Alba and its perioeci*, or thirty neighbouring and dependent places, said to have been colonies, and called *Albenses*; 2. the *Latin demi*, about Alba and its territory, the number of which we may assume, without fear of being mistaken, to have likewise amounted to thirty. They formed the Latin state, and stood in the same relation to Alba in which Latium afterwards stood to Rome; 3. the *Tyrrhenian towns on the coast*, which were properly foreign to the body of the Latin state, but may possibly have been in alliance with it. I have succeeded in throwing more light upon this relation between Alba and the Latin towns than I myself could formerly have expected; I have found all the names of the thirty Albensian towns, but the list of the others is not complete.

ALBA generally appears to us almost as a mythical place, because it vanishes from Roman history at so early a period; but there can be no doubt that its existence is a perfectly historical fact, and that, too, in the relation I have just indicated. But it never was the mother-city of Rome; the first elements out of which Rome grew up may, perhaps, at one time have constituted a portion of the towns which, in a state of dependence as perioeci, were united with Alba into one state, but may have separated themselves from it at an early period: Rome itself was never founded by Alba. The place where Alba was once situated is still so distinctly marked that it cannot be mistaken. From the testimonies of the ancients, we know that it was situated at the foot of the Alban hill, forming one long street, high above the

Alban lake, whence its name *Alba Longa*. Every one in that district shows the spot near the place called Palazzuolo, where may be seen the ancient tomb of a praetor with six fasces distinctly cut into the rock. This site has been recognised by several Italians, chiefly men without learning, but who had eyes to see that on this spot the rock has been cut away to a considerable height. This part must be conceived to have been below the town, so that the lake, even when its waters were very low, rendered the town perfectly inaccessible. The present level of the lake is the result of a tunnel (*emissarius*); but I am of opinion that formerly it must have been much lower.[1] In this manner the town was safe on that side, for the rock was cut away to such a height as to render it impossible to scale it by means of ladders; on the precipitous side of the rock opposite no artificial protection was necessary. Thus the town could be attacked only on the two accessible sides, which for this reason were fortified. The summit of the hill was probably fortified by an arx. The hill, now called Monte Cavo, though only 2,900 French feet in height, is one of the highest in that district; from it a person acquainted with Roman history enjoys the most magnificent prospect, for he may there survey the whole territory of the Roman state such as it was until the fourth century of the city. On this summit stood the very ancient temple of Jupiter Latiaris, which was certainly as old as the temple on the Capitoline, and a road led up to it which is still quite intact, and is made in the same style as the Roman high roads. There the Alban dictators once used to ride up to offer their thanks to Jupiter Latiaris for victories they had gained; Roman generals also triumphed there, when they could not obtain permission from the senate to celebrate their triumph in the Capitol; there lastly the Feriae Latinae were celebrated. The temple is now completely destroyed, and the foundation stones, which still existed there, were broken down in the 18th century. The large blocks of

[1] See *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i., p. 204.

stone were too huge for the puny race, and were, accordingly, broken to pieces to build a monastery. The last remains, consisting of beautiful square blocks, were carefully raised from the ground in the year 1780 or 1790. The Monte Cavo, like the lake, is of a volcanic nature.

LAVINIUM, which is nothing else than Lacinium in Oenotria (both forms being only dialectic varieties of Latinium), was the real sanctuary of Latium, and every year a common sacrifice was offered there by all the Latins. There is a tradition, that six hundred families were sent thither from Alba, that is, ten from every demos, the thirty Albensian and the thirty Latin towns. In this manner the statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus resolves itself into a general formula of a common settlement, proceeding from Alba and *commune Latium* (this is the correct name for all the Latins, like *κοινὸν Θεσσαλῶν*). Originally Lavinium was regarded as common property, like Washington; but when subsequently it became a place of importance, it obtained its independence, and was a town like all the others.

Besides Lavinium, which was fabulously said to be a Trojan colony, there existed on that coast, between the Tiber and Antium, two other places, LAURENTUM and the Rutulian ARDEA, which are familiar to us from the Aeneid. The ending *entum* in Laurentum is Pelasgian, as in the case of Maluentum and others; but it is Latinised, the native form probably was *οὖς*, *Λαυροῦς*. After the Volscian calamity, when the whole Latin confederacy broke up, Ardea was a separate town: it received a Romano-Latin colony, and accordingly entered into an entirely new relation. Cyclopean walls are still found there, but the place is so desolate, that at present it has only thirty houses with about eighty inhabitants.

The most important of the Latin towns in the vicinity of Rome was TUSCULUM; it was distant only a few miles and could be seen from Rome, being situated above Frascati. During the middle ages, it was destroyed by the

degenerate Romans, and never restored on the height, but the survivors were obliged to settle at the foot of the hill, which was the origin of the modern Frascati. The ruins of Tusculum which have been dug out are very important; the theatre was found with very beautiful statues in it, but it has been covered over again. A number of pedestals with inscriptions also were found, which are no doubt as ancient as the persons they described; some are as old as the period after the Hannibalian war, as for example, the one of Fulvius Nobilior, the conqueror of Aetolia: nowhere have so many ancient stones been brought to light; but the number of inscriptions belonging to the earlier times and even to the Augustan age is extremely small. The whole district belongs to Lucien Bonaparte, who has made excavations, in the process of which very many things of importance have been discovered. If he had continued them, extraordinary things would certainly have been brought to light; but he has no interest for anything except works of art, statues and the like, and it is impossible to make him see the importance of the remains of antiquity. He has the most unhistorical mind, and is unable to understand of what interest antiquities can be to history: the most beautiful things have been sold by him. He is one of those men who enjoy a high degree of celebrity without deserving it: he is lively, but absurd, and an extremely bad epic poet. He has laid out a garden on a hill, and on a box-tree in it he has inscribed in order the names of the greatest epic poets, beginning near the root: out of modesty he has put his own name lowest, and ascends up to Homer. It was impossible to induce him to make excavations according to a regular plan. I have often been in despair about it: this is a grief which a man may often have to bear in Italy, because excavations can be so easily made. The Fasti Capitolini are of extreme importance in Roman history; three large pieces of them had been found behind the church of S. Maria Liberatrice, and I implored the authorities to grant me permission to dig there, offering

to bear the expenses myself; but I could not obtain permission, and was told that it would be done in due time, and that our descendants also must have something to do. Such things are a severe trial of one's patience. If excavations were made at Tusculum, a Roman Herculaneum would be found. I do not mean to say that buildings equally well preserved would be discovered, but the ruins are very large, and the streets would certainly be found. When I was there, excavations were accidentally made below a wall, but they were afterwards stopped, for Lucien Bonaparte was inexorable. Once, during excavations which were continued only for a few weeks, a whole street with the walls of the houses up to a certain height was discovered; it was of the most perfect construction, although it was only the street of a country town, for Tusculum was certainly not larger than Coblenz. The street was completely filled with pieces of architecture, which had fallen down during the barbarous process of destruction: columns of the most beautiful marble were found, but broken to pieces, and statues of the most exquisite workmanship, such as one might expect to find at Rome during its most brilliant period. The architecture is that of the imperial period; the street also contained a well, the water of which was carried down from a hill. Very ancient inscriptions also were found, one of which contained the name of A. Sicinius, who is mentioned by Livy in the war against Perseus. If the Forum were laid open, Fasti and law-tables would no doubt be brought to light; it is still possible to say whereabouts it must have been situated. In like manner the site of the Forum of Praeneste was known, and fragments of the Fasti of Verrius Flaccus were found there, although the excavations were made very carelessly. In later times Tusculum was the most brilliant among the Latin towns.

The second Latin town in point of rank was TIBUR, now celebrated, under the name of Tivoli, for its waterfalls, the charming nature of the country, and the beauty of its ruins.

Some persons erroneously consider the sepulchral monument of Cellius, built in the age of Augustus, to be a temple of the Sibyl. Tibur ruled over a considerable number of dependent towns. Its present circumference dates from the middle ages, for in antiquity it was considerably smaller. All these towns were very little, though they have a great name in history. Two learned Jesuits, Cabral and Del Re, have written a very good topographical history of Tivoli.

The third Latin place is PRAENESTE, now Palestrina. This metathesis is common in Italian; even when they write correctly, they speak badly from affectation, especially the higher classes: instead of *una capra*, the Roman people usually say *una carpa*. The *l* and *r* also are interchanged: at the time of the French revolution, when a republic was forced upon the Romans, they were unable to pronounce the name, and said *la Repubrica*. I have found traces of a form *Penestra* belonging to the time when the western empire still existed; in the middle ages *civitas* was always added, and the simple names were thereby completely suppressed; people, therefore, did not say *Lanuvium*, but *civitas Lanuvina*, and so also *civitas Penestrina*. Praeneste was an immense place both in regard to its extent and to its fortifications, and was situated on a hill. Fortuna was its tutelary divinity, whose temple with its *temenos* occupied the acra, and the whole of the present little town of Palestrina is situated within the ruins of that temple. We still possess descriptions of it belonging to the end of the thirteenth century; many parts of it must then have been preserved; in the fourteenth the town was taken by pope Bonifacius VIII., and everything was then destroyed with barbarous fury; at present we can only admire the immense substructions on the side of the hill, for the town, like many others, was built up the hill in the form of terraces; and when it was intended to enlarge the town, a new terrace was built.

In Roman history Praeneste does not appear as an

important town till after the Gallic time. As to the impatience with which it, more than any other Latin town, bore the Roman yoke during the fifth century, from the Samnite wars until the war of Pyrrhus, we have distinct indications, although history is silent about it. The Praenestines made repeated attempts to shake it off; but although they were unsuccessful in this, still they gained the respect of the Romans, and obtained from them an honourable relation, with which they were satisfied. After this, they were the most faithful allies of the Romans, and during the Hannibalian war they were as attached to them as they had previously been intrepid in their struggles for their own independence. During the Social War they obtained the franchise, and were passionate champions of the Marian party. Marius the younger there sustained the terrible siege, after which Sulla took the town, and shewed the first symptoms of his raving cruelty: he butchered the whole population, and established a colony of veterans in the place. The town became quite desolate. Most of the Latin towns had perished at an early period.

LANUVIUM, afterwards *civitas Lanuvina*, on the Via Appia, still shows remains of a large wall, and indications that it once was a splendid town; it must not, however, be supposed to have been very extensive. Among its buildings, I may notice the temple of Juno Lanuvina, a common sanctuary for the Romans and Latins.

ARICIA was situated on the same road; its arx was on a height, but the town itself in the valley; at present the road most inconveniently and dangerously runs right across the height. Aricia was somewhat nearer Rome than Lanuvium; for a time it seems to have been the first among the Latin towns, I allude to the period after the banishment of the kings, when Rome and Latium were separated. The temple and grove of Diana Aricina were near the beautiful lake of Nemi, not far from Aricia.

GABII, one of the most ancient towns, has a traditional

greatness in the earliest history of Rome. Dionysius still saw its extensive walls, of which at present every vestige has disappeared, but the ruins of the cella of a vast temple of Juno may still be seen. History does not inform us when the town was destroyed, but it was probably during the period of the Aequian wars, for after them it is no longer mentioned in the history of the republic; and in the age of Cicero it was a deserted place. Excellent remains were found there during the excavations made by Prince Borghese; he came upon ruins of the Forum, various works of art, many inscriptions and statues, which, though not of the first order, are yet of good workmanship. Under the Roman emperors a population appears to have again assembled in several of those towns, which were situated on high roads; whence they rose again, though they remained small places with a wretched population of vagabonds from all parts, who did not form a civil community, although they had a civic constitution. Hence Gabii at a later period had a bishop. This also accounts for the fact, that works of art belonging to a late period of Rome are found in those early destroyed places. At present Gabii is quite deserted.

The place for the general assemblies of the Latins was near the Alban lake, which, like a crater, is environed by a high ridge of surrounding hills. The place of meeting is supposed, and I think justly, to have been on the other side of this crater; but there is no evidence to support this view. The spot is now occupied by the town of Marino, below which there is a beautiful well, generally believed to be the well of Ferentina.

The tunnel of the Alban lake, a wonderful work, is one of the curiosities of Latium; it runs nearly three Roman miles under ground towards the place of its destination, and was intended to carry off the water of the lake, which, when, in consequence of earthquakes, the subterraneous passages had become blocked up, rose above the ridge of the crater and inundated the country. I have already

spoken about this extraordinary structure in my History of Rome,[1] and shall, therefore, confine myself to a brief recapitulation. It is difficult to form a clear idea of the matter. Imagine the crater filled to the edge, and bear in mind that it was intended to give to it a level about 200 feet lower. In order to attain this, a line was first drawn in the contemplated direction of the tunnel, and by this line it could be seen how deep it must be to answer its purpose. In order to obtain the level, and at the same time to employ a great many hands, shafts were sunk along the whole line at a distance of less than a hundred feet from one another. It was easy to calculate how deep each shaft ought to be, so as to bring the bottom of the tunnel to the level which it was intended to give to it. These numerous shafts also facilitated the running off of the water on account of the pressure of the air, and at the same time rendered access to the tunnel easy. On any other plan only few persons could have been employed at a time, whereas now from every shaft two parties worked in opposite directions and broke through the rock. This working of different parties towards one another also insured their keeping the exact level. This tunnel, which was the admiration even of ancient Rome, has now existed for a period of 2500 years; it is still entire, and will exist in all time to come, unless some great revolution of the earth shall break it to pieces. The Roman cloacae are of the same character, and will endure until the last day of the earth. There are many such tunnels in the Roman territory, of which at present the advantages alone are perceptible, but whence they carry the waters can no longer be ascertained. Such is the case near lake Nemi: the whole valley of Aricia was formerly a lake, which is now perfectly drained. There, too, a great thing was effected by a little tunnel: the valley of Aricia is one of the most fertile in the world, and is still the same as it is described by Pliny. The fertility in Italy is so great

[1] Vol. ii. p. 507, foll.; comp. *Lect. on Rom. Hist.* vol. i. p. 248, 3d edit.—Ed.

that wheat, unless it is weeded, cannot grow; agriculture there requires a degree of industry of which we have no idea; if any one were to introduce there the system of Flemish or English agriculture, it would lead to ruin.

The *Vallis Albana* is the modern valley of Grotta Ferrata.

In the east of Latium, in its narrower sense, we have the towns of

The Hernicans.

We know only five of them; Anagnia was the capital, to which the others were opposed as a political body. We here again find a parallel phenomenon: the same relation which existed between Alba and the Albensian towns, and between Rome and the Latin towns, appears to have existed between Anagnia and the towns of the Hernicans. This is briefly, but officially, alluded to in the Triumphal Fasti, where Q. Marcius Tremulus triumphs *de Anagninis Hernicisque.* The other towns were *Frusino*, *Ferentinum*, *Verulae*, and *Alatrium.* There can, however, be no doubt that they had more towns; some must have been taken from them by the Volscians and Aequians, while others may have continued to exist, but decayed and perished, so that we have no information about them. Livy, in speaking of the last war against the Hernicans, says, *omnes Hernici nominis populi,* except three. I have a conjecture which is a combination of several traces, and according to which their number was forty. All the five above-mentioned places still exist; they are generally small and poor, with the exception of Anagnia, which is a place of some consequence; but all of them are still imposing on account of their ruins and their mighty Cyclopean walls, in which towers and gates are still preserved.

Servius, on the Aeneid, and the ancient Scholia on Virgil, fragments of which were published about ten years ago by A. Mai from a Veronese MS., state that the name *Hernici*

is derived from the Sabine word *hernae*, which Arndt very happily compares with the Swiss *firn* (mountain); as there exists a radical affinity between the two languages, such a comparison is certainly admissible. According to this, the Hernicans were a Sabine or Marsian colony. Another statement, however, though of very weak authority, in Julius Hyginus, makes the Hernicans Pelasgians. If we consider that the Sabines pressed forward at a comparatively late period, perhaps about the time of the foundation of Rome, and that the Hernicans dwelt on the other side of the Oscan nation of the Aequians, it is probable that the Hernicans, like the Latins, were of Tyrrhenian origin. An etymology like that mentioned before is very captivating, and it is not easy to get rid of it; but if we ask ourselves, What is the ground of the derivation? How could the name come from their habitations? Did the other Sabines call them Hernicans in the same manner in which the Scotch Lowlanders call the Gael in the mountains Highlanders? It is possible that the name Hernicans is only a surname to another national name; they may, in this case, have belonged to a different race, and have received that surname from the Sabines. That a people should call itself mountaineers from its habitations is very surprising. The derivation may be very accidental: in like manner the Thuringians might be said to owe their name to the old word *Taure*, which signifies "mountain." If we assume that the Hernicans were Tyrrhenians, they occupied exactly the district in which they could have maintained themselves against the shock of the Ausonians, who were pressed on by the Sabines. But nothing decisive can be said on this point, we can only form conjectures; and we must carefully distinguish between what is conjectural and what is certain.[1]

[1] Comp. *Lect. on Rom. Hist.*, vol. i. p. 149, 3d edit. which passage belongs to the Lectures delivered in 1828-29. In the *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 101, and ii. p. 82, however, the Sabine origin of the Hernicans is considered more probable. The number forty also is connected

There is no occasion for saying anything more about the towns of the Hernicans which I have mentioned. On the side of a rock, near the town of Ferentinum, there still exists a fragment of a will engraved in the stone. A wealthy citizen leaves a legacy, and fixes the interest of his landed property. The late Madame Dionigi, who made a drawing of it and published it, states that two of the pieces of land still exist in that district and bear the same name. A great many things of this kind continue to exist in some parts of Italy from ancient times; he who lives there in intimate familiarity with every-day affairs, and who does not mind spending months in those places, may recover the past to an extent which we believe altogether impossible.

The Hernicans formed part of the Roman and Latin confederacy, and had their share in the Feriae Latinae. In ancient times they were allied with Rome on equal terms, and shared with her and Latium all that they conquered in war. Afterwards this alliance was broken up, as I shall show in the second volume of my History,[1] because being weak and powerless, they could no longer claim their former rights. After the Gallic calamity, when Rome had fallen, they made themselves independent, and thirty years later the ancient treaty was renewed, and remained in force for fifty years, to the great advantage of the Hernicans. They were a small people, which did not extend, while Rome enlarged her dominion immensely. Hence the Romans demanded that the relation which had hitherto subsisted between them should be discontinued. In consequence of this, a war arose between them and the Hernicans, in which the latter had reason bitterly to repent their presumption.

---

with this view, because the number four is Sabine. I will therefore not suppress the fact, that most of my MSS. have *fourteen* instead of *forty*, which may possibly contain a different combination, though I have been unable to divine what it can be.—Ed.

[1] In the third vol. of the new edition; as for the special passages, see the Index to it.—Ed.

The Volscians and Aequians.

Both these Ausonian nations lived within the boundaries of Latium in its wider sense. The Volscians were subdivided into smaller parts, the Antiatan, Ecetranian, and other Volscians without any definite name. All the coast towns, as far as the upper Liris, were Volscian, as e.g. Anxur or Terracina, Privernum, Sora, Arpinum, Fabrataria, Fregellae, etc. The Aequians, on the other hand, dwelt on the one side as far as Praeneste, and on the other as far as lake Fucinus in the north. The Aequians and Volscians are almost always mentioned together, just as Romans and Latins, whence it is probable that isopolity existed between the two nations. Every man belonging to one nation might take up his abode among the other with which it was in isopolity: he there enjoyed higher rights than an alien; he was not, indeed, a full citizen, but a free member of the community; he was what was termed in the middle ages a pale-burgher. This is a relation which, on the whole, is seldom rightly understood by German jurists, and even by K. F. Eichhorn, who, in other respects, is a man of the greatest merit in matters of German law. Such an isopolity must have existed between the Aequians and Volscians; but besides this, they must have had another political connection, for a large party of the Aequians very frequently made common cause with a numerous body of the Volscians.

It is an important point to decide, as to whether the Volscians always inhabited the towns on the coast from Antium as far as Terracina, which are called Volscian, or whether they took possession of them as conquerors. At first I shared in the general error, thinking that they had always been Volscian; afterwards, I began to doubt—the first step towards truth—and to consider the possibility of its being otherwise; and now I am convinced that the

country was originally inhabited by Tyrrhenians, that it was afterwards conquered by the Volscians, and that this event did not occur till after the banishment of the kings. All the places on the coast from Terracina to Antium, as well as Velitrae in the interior, were once Pelasgian, and may be justly called Latin, this being the ancient and common name. Receive this result of my inquiries with confidence; there is no danger of your being mistaken. In like manner, the Aequians extended their dominion in the direction of the Latins and Hernicans at the expense of both.

All the Volscians did not form one common state: the people of Arpinum, Sora, Anxur, Formiae, and Fundi may, at the time of their first conquest, have mutually assisted one another; but when their possessions were secured, when Antium and Ecetrae had become Volscian, the towns situated farther behind probably did not exert themselves for the other Volscian places.

In regard to the Aequians, it would almost seem, as if they had formed one compact state, although each of the several towns could, by itself, do little or nothing; scarcely one of them is deserving of notice. If we possessed the ancient commentaries on the Aeneid, we should know a great deal more about the ethnography and chorography of those parts. Virgil speaks of Nersae as one of the principal towns of the Aequians: *et te montosae misere in proelia Nersae;*[1] editors have unwarrantably changed this into *Nursae*, and referred it to Nursia, which is an Umbrian town in the Apennines beyond the Sabines, to which the Aequians never penetrated. People will not own, that there are things of which they know nothing. The books of Servius unfortunately have come down to us only in a wretched abridgment: if we examine the first two books, of which we have the original, we cannot but feel respect for Servius as a great grammarian. In like manner, the name of mount Vesulus—in the illustration of the boar inhabiting

[1] *Aen.* vii. 744.

the marshes of the valley of Laurentum and the heights of Vesulus—has been senselessly referred to a hill near the sources of the Padus.[1] The hill must have been in the neighbourhood of Laurentum, in a district which Virgil knew very well, and which must afterwards have lost its name. I can well imagine what kind of a place Vesulus may have been, but it was most assuredly not a glacier of the Alps. This is one specimen of the perverse manner in which Virgil has been commented upon; an able commentary on the Aeneid, not too diffuse, has yet to be written; in regard to the Eclogues and the Georgics, Voss has done everything that can be desired.

The Aequians extended as far as lake Fucinus. When in the middle of the fifth century the Romans subdued them, they destroyed nearly fifty of their places, and forced the franchise upon them. Afterwards they obtained favourable terms and fair treatment, but the first shock of the war was terrible.

In the second and third books of Livy, the Volscians and Aequians generally come in contact with each other on mount *Algidus*. There are different opinions as to what mountain is meant by this name; scholars commonly rely on a passage in the Itineraries, where a place *Algidus* or *Algidum* is mentioned. The district is now never visited, because it is the haunt of fearful robbers; however, after I had left Italy, a friend of mine visited and described the localities. Between the countries of the Latins and Hernicans, there was a high and cold table land, *locus algidus*, not hills in the proper sense, but a rugged district covered with wood (*ilex*). At present there remain but slight traces of that forest, which is a little to the north of Velitrae. As the Aequians and Volscians were contiguous there, they separated the Hernicans from the Romans and Latins, and thus were pernicious to the latter. According to these statements, you will have no difficulty in finding the situation of mount Algidus in your maps.

[1] *Aen.* x. 708.

ANTIUM was a Volscian place; I do not mean to say that the whole population consisted of Volscians, but it had received a Volscian colony, which gave the prevailing name; as Virgil says, *Tusco de sanguine vires,* so we may say of Antium, *Volsco de sanguine vires.* In ancient times, Antium was an important maritime and commercial place, but also the haunt of pirates; afterwards it became a *colonia maritima,* that is, its inhabitants were bound to serve in maritime war, and on extraordinary emergencies; they had the Roman franchise, but not the right of voting. The place was greatly favoured, and in the course of time became the emporium of the whole Latin country; its harbour was much better than that of any of the other towns on the same coast, such as Laurentum and Lavinium, which had only road-steads. At a later time, it was artificially improved, a circumstance which had become necessary, for the mud of the Tiber, which was carried along the coast, filled up the harbour. Afterwards Antium was one of those places, in which the wealthy Roman nobles were fond of taking up their summer residence, especially during the first century after Christ. Nero changed it into a military colony, but of an irregular kind.

TERRACINA or ANXUR, was a large and ancient Tyrrhenian city; Anxur is acknowledged to be its Volscian name. Its double name alone leads to the supposition that the place had a mixed population.

ECETRAE, one of the central points of the Volscian population, must be looked for in the interior of the country, above the Pontine marshes, and not far from Ferentinum. It afterwards entirely disappears like so many other places in that district. I cannot explain this otherwise, than by supposing that the Romans have drawn a veil over the Samnite wars. The time when so many places were destroyed there, must have been that when the Samnites penetrated into the heart of Latium.

The Volscians, like the Aequians, belonged the Ausonian race, of which I have spoken in the general survey of the

Italian nations. If you compare the names, you will find that the Opicans and Apulians were one and the same people, and that the names of the ancient Italian nations have undergone various changes without a difference in meaning. Thus the *Aequi* are also called *Aequani*, *Aequuli*, and *Aequiculi*, all of which are one and the same name, just as *Graeci* and *Graeculi*, and *Hispani* and *Hispalli*, which were originally used without any difference of meaning. The Aequians and Volscians, as I said before, belonged to this Oscan or Ausonian race, to which Latin writers also give the name *Aurunci*, while the Greeks call them *Ausones*. The same name often has a general signification, and sometimes again it is applied only to a special part, just as *Thessalians* sometimes signifies the inhabitants of the country of Thessaly, and sometimes the population of Cyzicus, Ravenna, and Agylla, without there being any necessity of thinking of colonisation. In the same manner, Auruncans or Opicans are both the name of the whole race, and at the same time the name of separate portions. This changeableness in the use of names renders the survey of the history of ancient nations difficult, as the ancients themselves never express an opinion on this twofold meaning, and as those whose works are extant, are often themselves in error about it.

The Volscians, thus regarded as a portion of the Ausonians or Auruncans, extended from the Apennines in the neighbourhood of Arpinum along the Liris, south of the Hernicans as far as the coast of Antium. But there can be no doubt that they dwelt farther east, and the migration of the Cascans and Priscans was certainly owing to a commotion among that race. The Aeneid contains many traces of the original population of Latium, as for example, when the poet says, *Memini Auruncos ita ferre senes.*[1]

I have already spoken of the Volscians on the coast, of Antium, Terracina, and of the Ecetrani, whose name is often mentioned in history, but whose town is not spoken of

[1] Virgil, *Aen.* vii. 206.

anywhere; from one passage of Livy[1] alone, it may be inferred that it was situated near Ferentinum: it is possible that it may have been taken from the Hernicans by the Volscians. The population of such towns must never be conceived to have been totally changed. The Gauls, and similar uncivilised nations, sometimes did extirpate the ancient population; but people like the Romans and Volscians only settled as colonists among a conquered population, taking a part of its territory for themselves, either for the purpose of cultivating it themselves or of changing the former owners into coloni. Such also was the case with the population of Antium, as I have already mentioned. In the second volume of my Roman History, I shall explain, what in Livy's history is quite inconceivable, namely, how it happens that Antium appears as a thoroughly Volscian town, which can be accounted for only by the idea we form of the power of the Volscian colonists. Livy is not the only cause of the confusion, but the annalists of the seventh century also have their share in it. If we had but Fabius, we might safely say, that we required no further deductions to discover the ancient relation, which in his work was undoubtedly quite clear and obvious.

FUNDI and FORMIAE likewise belong to those Volscian towns established on ancient Tyrrhenian foundations; but ARPINUM, the birth-place of Marius and Cicero, is the most immortal among the Volscian towns. The present circumference of the walls shows that it was a large and strong place. This town, impelled by necessity, remained faithful to the Romans when they were hard pressed by the Samnites.

FREGELLAE is found in our maps in the vicinity of Arpinum, and not far from the Liris. It is remarkable in history, and its first occurrence in Livy throws considerable light upon the course of events. It was a Volscian town, and was destroyed by the Samnites; the Romans then, contrary to the ordinary Italian law of nations, sent a

[1] *Hist. of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 93, notes 194 and 195.—ED.

colony into it. The Samnites, who were allied with the Romans, denied their right to establish a colony there. This was one of the chief causes of the second Samnite war. The Samnites, however, were wrong in claiming it, for Fregellae was the key to the Via Latina, and hence the security of the Roman frontier demanded that the place should be in the hands of the Romans: to the Samnites it was a point of attack, to the Romans it was a means of defence; unless, therefore, the Samnites intended to make war upon the Romans, they were wrong in opposing its occupation by the Romans. Such circumstances must be taken into consideration, in deciding upon the justice or injustice of a question. It is difficult to comprehend how that town rose to such extraordinary power. Pyrrhus conquered it, and it suffered greatly; but from the last book of Livy we see that thousands of Sabellian families, Samnites, Pelignians, and others had settled there. This circumstance, however, was followed by consequences unfortunate for Fregellae. The numerical increase made the town proud, and during the disputes between the Latin colonies and Rome, it claimed to be at their head. Encouraged by the measures of the Gracchi, it obstinately demanded the franchise long before the Italicans came forward. On the whole, ancient history presents many parallels to modern history, sometimes they occur on a larger scale in antiquity and sometimes in modern times. The relation here alluded to is that of the Irish in their connection with England. When Ireland, in 1782, demanded its independence, the Anglicans in their claims against England, went far beyond the Roman Catholics and the other dissenters, and they alone gained advantages. A small parallel in comparison with the great one in antiquity occurs at Geneva, in the relation between the *bourgeoisie* of the suburb St. Gervais to the *citoyens* of the old town, where the *natifs* had all the real power, while the *habitans* possessed only very little. Fregellae, then, stood at the

head of the Latin colonies, and looked with pride upon its power; its inhabitants believed that Rome would not allow matters to come to extremes, and if they should come to that, they counting the population of the Latin colonies found that they were stronger than Rome by many hundred thousands: they thought that they might oppose the Romans, degraded by freedmen and poverty, with an able force of free country people. But the result was quite different. Rome acted with cunning: the Italian allies had not yet made up their minds, and did not yet take part in the interests of the Latins, thinking that the Latin colonies would take care of themselves alone, and that, if it should come to a war, they would become reconciled with Rome, and leave the Italian allies to settle their affairs as best they could. Even the other colonies showed no common interest, perhaps because they were jealous of Fregellae, or they hesitated because they were so much scattered among the Umbrians, Etruscans, etc, and for that reason were wanting in courage. Fregellae thus stood alone: it was conquered and destroyed by L. Opimius, and never restored. Fabrataria, another colony, was established in its vicinity.

The Latin colonies, *Interamnium*, *Sora*, and *Casinum*, formed a complete chain of fortresses in the same district. It was partly before the outbreak of the second Samnite war, and partly during its progress, that the Romans were anxiously bent upon establishing fortified places; and these measures made them as secure as France was by its frontier fortresses. Their frontier was thus very effectually protected against the Samnites, for all those fortresses were planned with great sagacity. The Samnites, who, besides their unsatisfactory constitution, had no fortresses, were thus weak, and the Roman army could enter Samnium without meeting with any obstacle. They were not inferior to the Romans in bravery, but were nevertheless conquered by them, because they were not agreed as to the manner in which the war should be carried on. It is pitiable to see

how the excellent people year after year became more unhappy, because they could not raise themselves above their traditionary prejudices, though their salvation depended upon it.

CAMPANIA.

THIS name has likewise different meanings. In the Roman sense, it is the country of the Campanians, as Samnium is the country of the Samnites; but the Campanians (on coins they are called *Capani*) are the inhabitants of Capa or Capua. In this sense Campania is a country of small extent, comprising Capua and the neighbouring places, Atella, Acerrae, Saticula, Calatia, Abella, Casilinum, Vulturnum, and Linternum. All these places were situated on the south of the Vulturnus, with the exception of Saticula; the *ager Falernus*, between the Vulturnus and Liris, however, likewise belonged to Campania. The Greeks, on the other hand, applied the name Campanians to all the nations of southern Italy belonging to the Oscan race, and this accounts for the fact that the name Campania was also used in a wider sense. This, however, occurs only in later times; and the extent of country which is marked Campania in all our maps, even in those of D'Anville, was not generally so designated until the time of Augustus. The name then embraced the whole country between the Vulturnus, the Liris, and the heights of the Apennines about Arpinum and Aquinum, so as to include Cales and Teanum,—in one word, all the Oscan tribes north of the Vulturnus as far as the frontier of the Volscians. I think I have already observed, in the account of the division of Italy into regions, that the expression *Campania Romae* was used as early as the fourth or fifth century of our era; it is found in the abridgment of Servius, which, however, was made in the

seventh century. The name Champagne has quite a different origin, probably from *campus*, a plain, whence *Campi Catalaunici*, which also comprise the foreign immigrants such as the Goths and others.

You must bear in mind this difference of meaning, in order that in reading the ancients, e. g., Livy, you may not fall into the mistake of believing that Campania is the name for the country which is so marked in our maps.

Advancing from the Liris, we come upon Ausonian tribes and CALES, which, according to Livy, was an Auruncian town. It was conquered by the Romans in the interval between the great Latin and the second Samnite war, and received a Roman colony.

TEANUM was a town of the Sidicines, likewise an Ausonian people. That northern district between the Vulturnus and the Liris, which did not extend as far as the mountains, is one of the most delightful and fertile countries; it is not, indeed, as productive as southern Campania, the *agri lugubres Campaniae*, the *πεδία Φλεγραῖα*, the coast country from Terracina to Gaeta and Formiae, where a man has the feeling as if he were in a paradise full of the most indescribable beauties—I was there in the month of March, when spring was already displaying all its loveliness; the summer, too, is not so scorching as in the neighbourhood of Rome, for the country is well watered, and that even in the middle of summer;—but the neighbourhood of Teanum is a most delightful hilly country, with a beauty and richness of trees which form a great contrast with those of Latium. This was the country of the Falernian and Massic wines. Teanum, according to Strabo, was a large town; but the present ruins do not show many traces of that greatness, though the silver coins which are found there show that Strabo is correct.

The LIRIS deserves the name of *taciturnus amnis*; it has no strong current, except in winter, when the heights are covered with snow. The VULTURNUS is quite different; descending from the neighbouring hills it has a strong

current; but it is not a beautiful river, being extremely muddy. It is, however, a pleasure to see the active flow of its waters. On its banks was situated

CASILINUM, on the site of the modern Capua, which is celebrated for the extraordinary defence of the Praenestine cohort against Hannibal: the perseverance of a besieged town is always interesting, and excites veneration. The garrison murdered the Campanian inhabitants, that the provisions might last so much longer. Hannibal took the place, and after that time it is not often mentioned again. The situation on the Via Appia somewhat raised its importance in the time of the emperors; its means of subsistence, as was the case with all places on high roads, were derived from commerce.

If we compare the present condition of Italy with what it was in ancient times, say under Nero or at the time of Pliny, there can be no doubt that Rome itself is only a shadow of what it then was; I have calculated that its population then amounted to from 600,000 to 700,000 souls. But the territory around Rome was in those days far more desolate than it is now: it is at present more thickly peopled, better cultivated, and happier. Under the later emperors the country may have somewhat recovered; in the fourth century, previously to the plague under Gallienus, it may have had a larger population, and so also in the time of Theodosius. But I entirely agree with Hume, against Wallace, that the population of Italy in antiquity was far less numerous than at present, except in Rome itself. Naples was then only a country town, of about 20,000 or 30,000 inhabitants, while at present it has 400,000. But notwithstanding all this, Italy possessed incomparably more wealth than at present, so that a small town was of much greater importance than one at present with a far larger population; a third-rate town, for example, was illustrious for its works of art to a much greater extent than any modern town of any country.

The name CAPUA is now transferred to the town built upon the ruins of Casilinum; ancient Capua was destroyed by the Saracens during the Lombardic period: its ruins can still be recognised; and among them the remains of an amphitheatre are particularly remarkable; but no ancient Campanian ruins are found there. I never was there, because at the time the country was not safe, and there are no high roads in those parts: I was a whole month at Naples, but was too much engaged to go to Capua. The inhabitants of the district are reported to form a band of robbers, and many a one is said to have had sad experience there. Notorious districts of this kind, however, are different at different times: you may often go to such a place without exposing yourself to any particular danger, while at other times it would be madness to approach it. During my residence at Rome, e.g., it was impossible to visit mount Algidus, whereas at present I have no doubt whatever that a person may go there without any danger. Capua is regarded by the ancients as an Etruscan colony, but we have every reason for supposing that it never was Etruscan. There is, in all probability, some confusion here between Etruscan and Tyrrhenian, because the Etruscans occupied the country of the Tyrrhenians as far as the Tiber, and the name of the latter must have been confounded with the former; the other places on the coast, unless they were Greek, were likewise Tyrrhenian. The name of this Tyrrhenian Capua is compared by the ancient grammarians with *Campi*, the name of the Pelasgian Chaonians. The town was taken, about the middle of the third century of the Roman era, by the Oscans, who were pressed onward by the Sabellians. At that time the district was under the supremacy of Cumae. But the Oscans did not remain long in the undisturbed possession of the place; the Sabellians having once established themselves in Samnium, did not stop short there, but pressing onward, compelled the Oscans at Capua to enter into an arrangement with them, and to admit a portion

of them as epoeci—a phenomenon not unusual in ancient times. But such an alliance was generally formed with faithless intentions, and either the ancient inhabitants murdered the conquerors, or the latter expelled the former: at Capua the Samnites made themselves masters of the city, but they seem either to have been expelled by the ancient population, or else to have become amalgamated with them. The Oscans had, perhaps, become a commonalty, and afterwards rose again; in the Roman period, at least, the Oscans are the ruling people at Capua. The greatness of the city is well known from Livy: it stood to Rome in the relation of isopolity; it had not submitted *in deditionem*, as is erroneously stated by Livy: its relation to Rome was the same as that of the ancient Latins, and as a compensation for the Roman conquests, it received an extension of its own territory. In these circumstances, Capua could with satisfaction look upon herself as the second city of Italy; but she was ambitious enough to wish to become the first, and with this view, faithlessly entered into an alliance with Hannibal against Rome, which was then in great distress, but had not broken its obligations towards Capua. We may say without hesitation, that Rome was generous towards Capua, and this was no trifling matter for Rome in its weakness: Rome then formed alliances which benefited other people. As Rome had grown and developed immensely, while the others had remained behind, and as Rome, nevertheless, acted towards them as before, we cannot help calling this generous, and the conduct of Capua unjust and ungrateful. A fearful judgment came upon Capua: it was not, indeed, destroyed, but the Campanians, especially the nobles, experienced a terrible fate. The city was afterwards again filled with all manner of people, and became a domain of the Roman republic. Subsequently, several unsuccessful attempts were made to establish a colony there, until J. Caesar founded one of 5000[1] Roman citizens.

[1] Our authorities state 20,000; but Niebuhr seems to mean families, as only fathers of three children were admitted. Cicero,

From this time forward Capua was a regular colony, and remained a respectable town as long as the Roman empire existed.

MINTURNAE, near the mouth of the Liris, and SINUESSA, belong to Campania in its wider sense; both are prominent places in the system of fortifications which the Romans carried out during the second Samnite war.

The FALERNIAN DISTRICT, between the Vulturnus and the Liris, probably derived its name from a destroyed town, Faleria.

The Oscan towns around Capua probably stood to that city in the same relation as Latium did to Rome. Among them I will notice ATELLA, between Capua and Naples, because the well-known *Atellanae* originated there. These Atellane farces are truly analogous to the modern farcical comedies, the principal personage of which also appeared in the ancient Atellanae. In a very useful glossary of the Neapolitan dialect, I found it stated, that the buffoon (*pulcinella*) was a real jester who lived 200 years ago; but the fact is, that he has been the same through the course of many centuries from the first introduction of the Atellanae.

ACERRAE deserves to be mentioned on account of the cruelty of which Hannibal was guilty towards its senate —the only cruel act that can be really laid to his charge. The town was destroyed in the second Punic war, and the Romans did nothing to restore it, although it had been faithfully attached to their cause.

NOLA was situated at a greater distance from Capua, and was not one of the Campanian towns properly so called; it was independent, and in no way subordinate to Capua. It might be doubted whether it was really an Oscan town; in Justin it is called a Chalcidian settlement,

---

however, thinks that the *ager Campanus* was not sufficient for more than 5000 persons. The most important passages relating to this subject are collected in Orelli, *Index Leg.* s. v., *Lex Julia Agraria* p. 188.—ED.

and I have no doubt that the whole chapter in which this occurs is taken from Timaeus. The coins of Nola have a perfectly Greek character and Greek inscriptions; this is indeed the case with those of Capua also, though not in the same degree as with those of Nola. My opinion is, that these places were originally Tuscan, and that during invasions of the Oscans and Sabellians, Capua lost this Tusco-Tyrrhenian character, while Nola retained it longer. If then the Greeks call the latter place Chalcidian, they do so because it received Greek, probably Chalcidian, epoeci from Naples, and not barbarians. All these towns were situated in the midst of barbarians, who, for the purpose of commercial transactions, even advanced to the Greek towns on the coast, and accordingly much more to a place which, like Nola, was situated in the midst of the country. Nola was built in that splendid plain of Campania, which extends between the Vulturnus and Naples: it is a perfect plain, with quite a volcanic soil; notwithstanding this, however, it is not dry, but very well watered, and almost marshy, whence the country abounds in draining canals lined with poplars. Nola, situated on the other side of mount Vesuvius, whose torrents of lava never reach so far, forms with Capua and Naples a triangle. In the second Samnite war it appears to have been an important town, for it sent 2000 men to Naples to defend that place against Rome; but in the course of the same war it was taken by the Romans. In the Hannibalian war, the fidelity of Nola was of infinite importance to Rome. At Nola the most beautiful Campanian vases have been found: they are made of an extremely fine clay; but they ceased to be manufactured as early as the time of Augustus, for the art of making them had been lost. They were made of clay mixed with asphalt, and then burnt, but so slightly that the asphalt was not changed by the process, hence the lightness and extraordinary fineness of the material. The darkness of the colour arises from the admixture of asphalt. Professor Hausmann of Göttingen first re-discovered the nature of the composition,

and the experiments he made with it which were perfectly successful. This is really an interesting discovery, of which good use might be made, if not in Germany, at least in Italy. The art had died away to such a degree, that in Caesar's time amateurs collected vases from Capua as well as from Corinth, and even opened tombs for the purpose of obtaining them. The vases of Arretium continued to be manufactured in the time of Augustus. The Campanian vases are not jars containing the ashes of deceased persons, such as we find elsewhere in tombs: the body was not burnt, but the skeletons are found in coffins, and on each side of the coffin, four, six, or eight vases of this kind are set up. As they were so slightly burnt, they are often found broken and crumbled, and it is a rare thing to find a large one preserved entire. They must be treated with great care, when brought to light and exposed to the atmospheric air.

CUMAE is the most ancient Greek colony in those parts, though it certainly cannot be as ancient as it is said to be. In the first edition of my Roman History, I had not sufficiently considered this point; it is one of the few subjects on which the objections raised against my view are well founded. I am now convinced, that the statement of Timaeus, for to him it belongs, is false. Certain it is, that Cumae was an ancient Chalcidian colony; but it might even be doubted whether the Chalcidian towns in Sicily were not more ancient. When Capua was taken by the Samnites, Cumae, too, was conquered, and lost its Greek character: the Greek population, which until then had formed the ruling class, became subjects; their fate was that of the American aborigines: they were not indeed extirpated, but lost their political existence. Gradually the Italicans spread more and more, and many families from Campania removed to Cumae, which thus gradually became Italian. The same also was the fate of Naples, though not to such a degree. Cumae for a long time ruled over the whole Phlegraean plain, that is, the Acte between

the Vulturnus and mount Vesuvius. *Dicaearchia*, on the site of the modern Puzzuoli, was then the port town of Cumae. In the time of king Darius, it was colonised by Samians, probably in the reign of Polycrates and Syloson.

Another Greek colony from Eretria had settled in the island of ISCHIA, which bore the Greek name *Αἰναρία*. It is a large extinct volcano, which, however, has repeatedly been active both in ancient and in modern times; for the island is remarkable for its internal fire, which is not yet quite extinct, and is still distinctly perceptible; hence it also contains hot springs; it is a truly paradise-like place on account of the fiery character of its whole nature, its soil, and its vegetation. The Greek colony afterwards disappears, and the island became Oscan simultaneously with Cumae.

Between Ischia and the main land of Naples, there are several other islands, which were no doubt called PITHECUSAE. One of them is NESIS (the modern Nisita), that is, the little island (*νησίς*), a proof showing how early the modern Greek pronunciation of the *η* became prevalent. The ancients do not mention it.[1] Another island was PROCHYTA. All these islands had Eretrian colonies.

DICAEARCHIA was a beautiful port, which was, no doubt, likewise taken by Campanians. After the capture of Capua, it came into the hands of the Romans, who established a Roman colony there, and called it PUTEOLI, though this name may have existed previously. The place then became the real port of Rome, for Ostia was bad, and the Portus Romanus on the right arm of the Tiber was not fit for sea-ships. The port of Puteoli, on the other hand, was naturally very beautiful, and even in the time of Augustus pains were taken to make use of the nature of the locality for the purpose of extending the port. Puzzolano, so excellent as a cement for water and harbour-works, was ready at hand

[1] This is a mistake, or else an error in the MSS., for Nesis is mentioned by Cicero, *ad Att.* xvi. 1, 1; 3, 6; 4, 1; and by Seneca *Ep.* 53.—ED.

in abundance, and in the greatest perfection. In the neighbourhood of Rome it is likewise found, but is not so beautiful; near Centumcellae, it was also employed in making the harbour, but it had to be conveyed thither from a distance. Its abundance in the neighbourhood led to the building of the molo of Puteoli. This *moles* of Caligula is in reality not so mad a scheme as it is commonly described: it was suggested by the wishes of rational people, but its gigantic extent was the work of madness: whenever Caligula took up a good idea, he at once turned it into something irrational. The whole commerce and intercourse of Rome with her transmarine provinces at that time was carried on by way of Puteoli; and it was there that St. Paul landed, for the voyage along the coast from cape Misenum to the mouth of the Tiber was very dangerous. The ships of that period were in many respects excellent, but in others they were very deficient. It must be supposed that at Puteoli the ships were generally so far unladen as to enable them to sail into the Tiber at Ostia; they also found at Puteoli more easily than on the Tiber, advantageous cargoes to carry back. So long as commerce supplied only the actual wants, so that there was little or no speculation, it was carried on by means of large fleets, or, according to the modern expression, of register vessels. In this way, Rome received from Egypt her supplies of corn, glass, linen, and papyrus. Such fleets, however, did not come from Egypt alone, but also from other quarters, among which Ionia, for example, is expressly mentioned. The expression for these fleets is *κατάπλους*, as we see from Lucian's dialogue of this name; but the term is also quite commonly used by Latin writers of the second and third century.[1] Puteoli, as a Roman colony, was very

[1] "It is a great mistake to believe that a period must be better known the nearer it is to us. This is not the case in antiquity. There can be no doubt that, e. g., we know the internal condition of Rome in the time of Cicero much better than during the second century after Christ, when we know nothing but what can be gathered from Pliny's letters. A merely mechanical mind imagines

celebrated on account of its situation and at the same time as a watering-place. Pope Gregory the Great quite seriously

that a period about which nothing is written, had nothing worth knowing; but whoever has an eye for the remains of antiquity, sees distinctly what has existed. Thus, for example, the *monte testaccio*, *mons testaceus* or *testarius* at Rome is not mentioned anywhere until we come to the documents of the seventh and eighth centuries, and the most ridiculous pains have been taken to discover it at an earlier period. It is not mentioned in the Regionaria, hence, it is said, it must have arisen afterwards, about the period of the eighth century, when Rome was a desert. The matter can be explained very simply. Every one who has practised eyes, knows what is to be recognised in those thousands of shells; but there are antiquaries who can see nothing at all except what they read in books. The ancients made very little use of wooden vessels, they nearly always used pottery ware. This produced an enormous quantity of shells. It was thought inexpedient to throw them into the river, and there must have been some police regulation, that all shells should be thrown on one heap. I was on the spot when a wall was dug out, and it was found that the heaps of shells extended up to the very walls of the city. I caused the digging to be continued farther, and found shells everywhere. It must have been a marsh which was filled with shells to a depth of five feet. Under Honorius a wall was built to defend Rome against the barbarians; it has a double inscription, in one of which we read *egestis immensis ruderibus*. Under Augustus a regular police was instituted, and all shells were regularly thrown there. Now, imagine Rome with nearly a million of inhabitants; assuredly many carts were employed every day in carrying away the broken vessels, which were all thrown on one spot, and may have already filled the whole place. When Aurelian built his wall, a portion was perhaps thrown back, and this may have been the beginning of the hill. According to Andr. Fulvius, the wall of the city under pope Clement VII., at the commencement of the sixteenth century, was so much covered on both sides, that it was impossible to walk there: a road was then made, and part of the rubbish was carried to the Forum, which was filled with it. Such you must imagine the *rudera immensa egesta* to have been. About the time of Honorius the wall had been cleared, not to have a hill outside, on which the Goths might have planted their engines to harass the city. He removed the rubbish on both sides, and thus raised an immense mound of shells. This explanation is as certain as if it were described in ancient authors, though not a single author speaks of it. Such also is the case with other

thinks that the hot springs of Puteoli are connected with purgatory.[1]

The real watering-place, however, was BAIAE, towards cape Misenum. It is very remarkable that at present the district is quite pestilential; if a man were to sleep there one night during the summer, he would be seized with a bilious fever, in consequence of the poisonous air. A French officer, who imagined this to be a mere prejudice, made a bet that he would sleep in the villa Borghese: he was urgently requested not to do it, but the next morning he was quite swollen, and after a few days he died of a putrid fever. The same is the case at Baiae, and yet the ancients, as we see from a fragment of Cicero's speech *in Clodium et Curionem*, most commonly stayed there in April, when it is already dangerous. I have discovered the explanation of all this, from a conversation with a common man. He said to me that the nature of the Pontine marshes was a very strange thing, that it was not possible for any one in summer to sleep there without fatal consequences, and that it was the same in many parts of Latium; but, he added, that to his own knowledge sailors and boatmen, even in the dangerous season, slept in their boats very near the coast without injuring their health. This proves that the poisonous atmosphere does not extend across the water. The man's remarks contain a significant hint. I remembered that the English ambassador, with whom I often took a walk there—he was not a man of learning—directed my attention to the fact, that beyond mount Posilipo, in the midst of the sea, ruins of ancient Roman houses were found, and he observed that the Romans must have had a singular taste in thus building houses in the midst of the water, and connected with the main-land by means of bridges, although

phenomena which present themselves at Rome, and about which not one passage can be referred to."

[1] Niebuhr was probably thinking of *Dial.* iv. 55, though Puteoli is not mentioned there, but Taurania, a place assumed to have existed in Campania.—ED.

there was no beauty to attract them. To abandon such a charming coast, and to build a house in the sea, was, he thought, a strange fancy. When, afterwards, I heard the account of the man I mentioned before, the matter ceased to be a mystery to me. Even at Formiae, and certainly at Baiae, the Romans built houses into the sea, in order to isolate themselves from the bad air: these are the *moles jactae in altum*, and on them people were safe.

The country there is indescribably beautiful and charming, and besides Baiae, the lake AVERNUS, surrounded by very ancient forests, is likewise a spot of great interest. Near it, a road has been cut through the rock leading to Cumae. Such roads were often constructed for the purpose of shortening the distance and avoiding the heights, for the Romans generally endeavoured by every means to shorten the roads. A similar road leads from Naples to Puzzuoli, likewise made to avoid a hill, which it would be very difficult to cross: hence the *crypta Pausilippana, Puteolana, Neapolitana.*[1] The Avernus was, no doubt, originally called ἄορνος, and with the digamma ἄϝορνος. This etymology has been rejected, because it implied the statement that birds could not fly over the lake, which, it is said, is an absurdity. But no bird settles there without dying in consequence, on account of the quantity of carbonic acid which is exhaled by the earth and the lake; dogs, too, are not safe there, but men may pass without any danger.

NAPLES[2] was originally called PARTHENOPE, and was, no doubt, situated on mount Posilipo, towards Nisita, where the crypta turns towards the cape. Afterwards, NEAPOLIS was built a few miles from it on the other side of the cape; and it is a mistake to believe that the two places were nearer each other. Parthenope was a colony of the Eretrians of Ischia, while Neapolis was a Cumaean settlement with an admixture of Athenians; and after the establishment of the

[1] Comp. Seneca, *Epist.* 57.—ED.

[2] Comp. *Lect. on Rom. Hist.* vol. i. p. 348, foll., 3d edit.—ED.

latter place, Parthenope was called PALAEPOLIS. In the second Samnite war, Palaepolis was taken by the Romans, and must have been destroyed, for it entirely disappears; Neapolis, on the other hand, became a federate town of Rome, and was treated with kindness. Strabo, however, relates, that the town was so much distracted by internal disturbances, as to be obliged to concede the franchise even to the Campanians, its natural enemies. But notwithstanding all this, it remained a perfectly Greek city until the imperial times; this is evident in the reign of Augustus, evident from a letter of the emperor M. Aurelius to Fronto, and evident, also, from Petronius; there exists, moreover, a great number of Greek inscriptions of the third century. Afterwards, we lose our thread. But the chapel of the ancient church of S. Rosa at Naples contains Greek inscriptions of the period when Naples was a free city, under the protectorate of Byzantium, that is, of the seventh or eighth century.[1] Traces of Greek words still exist in the Neapolitan dialect. The Italian word *golf* is evidently formed from κόλπος; the gulf of Naples is specially called *the* gulf; but the ancients also called it κρατήρ.

On this gulf, at the foot of mount Vesuvius, were situated the celebrated towns of POMPEII and HERCULANEUM, remarkable for their destruction and their re-discovery. Both are called Oscan, though it is said in regard to Herculaneum, that at an earlier period it was Tyrrhenian. But from their ruins, especially those of Herculaneum when compared with those of Roman origin, it is clear that the place had assumed an entirely Greek character. Pompeii was conquered by the Romans in the Social War, and there, too, we can clearly distinguish the ancient Oscan and the more recent Roman town.

In ancient times, the bay of Naples was encircled by a wreath of towns, extending all over the coast from Naples

[1] "I know that Greek inscriptions have also been discovered at Ravenna."

to Sorrentum and the promontory of Minerva; but I cannot trace them here, and must now proceed to the interior of Italy.

The Sabellians, Sabines, Samnites.

I am now going to speak of the great Sabellian nation; I shall treat of it according to its tribes beginning with the Sabines, who formed the original stock.

The names *Sabini* and *Sabelli* are the same, just as *Hispani* and *Hispalli*, *Graeci* and *Graeculi*. The form *Sabelli* is either a diminutive or changed by a pleonasm, *Sabinulus*, and, with a change of vowel, *Sabellus*.[1] This nation occupies a large extent of country in history; but we should be mistaken, if we were to suppose, that all the tribes included under the name were pure Sabines and that they alone inhabited the countries governed by them; for they did not by any means extirpate the ancient inhabitants when they conquered a country. According to a tradition admitted by Cato himself, which contains some truth, but disfigured, the Sabines had originally come from Amiternum, the highest district of the Abruzzi, or as we may call them, the real Apennine Alps. We must not, indeed, understand this, as if the Sabines had been autochthons there, as has sometimes been asserted; but the meaning is, that the tribe from which the different Sabellian cantons issued, came down from those mountains. The ancients say no more than this, but later writers have converted it into a genealogical connection.

[1] "I have adopted the ancient practice of calling the whole nation Sabellians, and the original tribe Sabines, because there is no instance of the Samnites, Marsians, etc., having been called Sabines, but only Sabellians."

We cannot decide how far the Sabellians constituted one race with the Opicans and Auruncans, whether they were akin in a degree like that subsisting between the upper and lower Germans, the Suabians and Saxons, or the Germans and Scandinavians, or whether they were as foreign to each other as the Romans were to the Etruscans. That they differed from each other, is expressly attested. But the ancients are too inaccurate in these matters to allow a careful modern inquirer to accept their statement without hesitation; and although Varro attests that the Sabines and Oscans spoke different languages, still we cannot ascertain, whether he meant only different dialects, or entirely different languages. In like manner, the extension of the Sabellians in southern Italy from the Apennines can be traced only very indefinitely. This much, e.g., is attested, that the neighbourhood of Beneventum was previously occupied by Oscans, without their being the original natives of it; they must have extended even farther upwards into the country of the Marsians, and must have been expelled by the Sabines. The name Maluentum shows, that originally a people of Tyrrhenian origin dwelt between the Apennines and the valley of the Calore. Before the Sabines conquered that district, they probably had their abode in the eastern Apennines. The real and unmixed Sabines occupied a considerable extent of country; in the narrowest sense, they did not touch the sea on either side, either the Adriatic or the Lower Sea, but they extended so far, as to be separated from the latter only by a narrow strip of land, from Amiternum to the vicinity of Rome. But they sent forth branches of their nation which established themselves in other parts and became great nations.

The Sabellian people had this peculiarity, that they formed both distinct tribes and different confederations. Some of them accordingly, such as the Picentians, were without any federal relations, while the four tribes dwelling in the Abruzzi, the Marsians, Marrucinians, Pelignians, and Vestinians, were on many occasions inseparably united,

and evidently formed a confederation with isopolity, similar to that subsisting between the Romans and Latins; it was, no doubt, at the same time, at least a defensive, if not an offensive, alliance. The supremacy must have belonged to one of these tribes by rotation, so that each of them may conveniently be called a canton. They stand completely by themselves, and without any connection with the mother people, the Picentians, Samnites, etc. This isolation of the Sabellian tribes was their misfortune. The Marsians and their allies never assisted the Samnites, but allowed themselves to be captivated by the Romans, by favourable terms, first to remain neutral, and afterwards to become their allies. Nor can the Samnites be regarded as a compact nation in their struggles against Rome; if this had been the case, they would unquestionably have offered a very different resistance, for they had a large population and an extensive territory. The Samnites, like the northern tribes, formed a confederation, but their bond of union was scarcely closer than that among their neighbours: they formed perfectly distinct states, which joined one another for a common purpose. The Hirpinians, Caudines, and Pentrians certainly formed a confederation; but the Frentanians did not, strictly speaking, belong to this union; they separated at an early time. To these we must add a fifth Samnite state, to which Nuceria Alfaterna belonged; its name is unknown, though it was perhaps called Alfaterna, and extended from Surrentum to the Silarus. Scylax of Caryanda clearly proves, that this district, from Surrentum to the Silarus, before it was occupied by Greeks, was inhabited by Samnites, and the same is manifest from Livy's account. When the Romans penetrated there, Nuceria was a Samnite town, and they conquered it as such. In this manner we have, exclusive of the Frentanians, who took no great part in the second Samnite war, four Samnite cantons, which were very populous. In no map are the Caudines mentioned as a tribe, but that they were one is

clear from Strabo and Velleius; manuals of geography and maps mention Caudium only as a town.

The LUCANIANS proceeded from the Samnites, but became quite independent of them. The connection with the mother-country was extremely loose with all these people; their migrations are quite different from those of other nations: they are conquests of emigrating bands of men, who for this reason lose their language and national character, and adopt those of the old inhabitants. According to a tradition, the Lucanians emigrated from Samnium as a *ver sacrum*. This phenomenon occurs among all the Italian nations: a people made a vow, that all boys born within a certain year should, after the lapse of twenty years, emigrate and seek a new home for themselves. Thus the Lucanians emigrated, and spread from the frontiers of Samnium as far as Rhegium on the straits of Messina. The ancient inhabitants were subdued, and thus three strata of different nations were mixed together: the ancient Oenotrians were conquered by the Oscans, and the Oscans by the Samnites. But these subjects afterwards rose against their rulers, and formed an independent state under the name of BRUTTIUM. The Bruttians, therefore, did not belong to the Sabellians; they must be regarded as a mixture of Oenotrians and Greeks, and were Greek rather than Italian, whence they were treated by the Romans as Greeks. The Greek language was so firmly established there, that in Terra di Lecce, about Otranto, documents were composed in the Greek language as late as the fifteenth century; specimens of it occur in the Biblioteca Barberini. In the town of Rossano in Calabria, Greek was spoken as late as the sixteenth century,[1] and in Sicily Greek poetry was written in the twelfth; when the Arabs were expelled the remaining population consisted of Greeks, and it was not till a later period that they became Italians. The praetor of Messina was, ever since the Greek times, called *Stratigo*,

[1] Compare *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 64, foll.

until in 1672[1] the people revolted against Spain, when the constitution and the office were abolished. The laws of king Roger and of Frederic II. were written in Greek.

In this manner, the component parts of the Sabellian nation, from the Picentians down to the Lucanians, presented different shades of their national character. The Sabine blood in some of them was probably not of more importance than the Frankish blood is among the modern French; for the 20,000 Franks of king Clovis were easily lost among the millions of Gauls. In our neighbourhood on the Rhine, however, the population is almost entirely Frankish, as the Franks settled here in great multitudes. The population here on both sides of the Rhine, and as far as the low German dialect is spoken, that is, as far as Andernach, is descended from the Ripuarian Franks. In the Netherlands also, there are Franks, but strongly mixed with Gauls, Batavian and Frisian tribes; still, however, the population is more Frankish than in France, and in northern France it is more so than in the south; from the Loire to Gascony only the lords of the land are Franks. In Languedoc, there was only a French garrison, and the remaining population, for centuries, remained Gothic. Although, therefore, the Franks extended even beyond the Pyrenees, their race, from the Main to Spain, presented very great differences. The country now called Franconia, scarcely contains any Franks at all. We cannot wonder, therefore, at the fact that in antiquity the Lucanians and the Sabines of Reate did not understand one another.

The constitution of the Sabellian nations seems to have been essentially democratic, so that in the course of time the subjects acquired the full right of free country people. This nation, then, in point of manners and character, was extremely respectable, and this is the special glory of the ancient Sabines, Marsians, and of the Samnites with their confederates; the Picentians and Lucanians are less deserving

[1] This is the date in the MSS., but it ought probably to be 1720.—Ed.

of this praise. The Latin poets, from Virgil to Juvenal, always set forth the former, when they want to describe the frugal Italian mode of living. If the nation had but formed one compact state, it would not have been too weak at all. The Samnites had as many free citizens as the Romans and Latins, but although their forces were numerically equal to those of the Romans, still there was this difference, that they did not form one body. There can be no question that the different cantons had the supreme command by rotation, and this constituted their great weakness in the conflict with Rome, for in courage and perseverance the Samnites were assuredly not wanting. Even when in one year they gained great advantages they were useless, as in the next year the command belonged to another nation. C. Pontius was the only man among the Samnites capable of governing a state: he might have saved his country, if it had trusted him unconditionally—the Romans would, no doubt, have raised him to the consulship year after year. But it would seem that he had the supreme command only in one town—he was probably a Caudine—while in the next year the Pentrians had the management of affairs. Other men did much, sacrificed everything, and dreaded nothing, but he alone had the power of saving his country. To what extent their country was ravaged, may be seen from the newly discovered fragments of Polybius, in which Pyrrhus, on entering Samnium, is described as terrified at the devastation of the country: the Romans had ravaged it in such a manner, that all traces of human habitations had disappeared: it was just what Peloponnesus is at present,[1] consisting of heaps of ruins and ashes, the villages were destroyed, trees were torn up, and not a trace of agriculture or the plough was left. All this the Samnites bore with inflexible determination; their desperate courage several times brought matters to a turning point, but they lacked the greatest of all things, the courage to sacrifice their prejudices and to

[1] This alludes to the war between the Greeks and Turks in 1828.—Ed.

change their constitution in such a manner as to adapt it to the circumstances of the time. Their descendants, in the Marsian or Social War, discovered their mistake, and adopted a new constitution; from the little we know of it, we must infer, that it was extremely well devised: it seems to have resembled that of the United States of America, concentrating the nation in regard to foreign enemies, but leaving the municipal sovereignty untouched. It is a pity that we do not know more about it; still, however, many things can be conjectured.

Of all the towns in the country of the Sabines proper, CURES is most renowned in tradition. The country of the Sabines, beginning at the Anio, extends beyond Amiternum, and consists of several divisions. The portion between the Nera and Anio is a hilly country; it is most adapted to the cultivation of olives, which, if well taken care of, would produce there excellent oil; corn, too, can be grown there, but it is unfavourable to the cultivation of the vine, whence Sabine wine was considered bad by the ancients, and is so still. In the angle descending towards Rome, the ancients mention no important towns; but farther up, we come to REATE and INTERAMNA. Reate is said to have been a very ancient place of the Aborigines, that is, the Prisci, and to have been taken from them by the Sabines. Near Reate the olive-growing district rises tolerably high into the Apennines. Lake VELINUS is situated there in a very wide hollow; it is said formerly to have been several miles in circumference, like lake Fucinus. When Curius Dentatus conquered that district for the Romans (463), he executed one of the most magnificent works in the world. He drew off the water from the lake in such a manner as to gain thereby several square miles of the most beautiful land; and at the same time the beautiful waterfall of Terni was formed. The crater of the lake is shut up on one side by the lofty Apennines, and on the other by a ridge of rock, which confined the river. Curius, therefore, according to a statement in one of Cicero's letters, cut through the ridge which

separated the river from the Nera. The level of this canal was from 130 to 140 feet above the river, and this gave rise to the matchless cascade, of course without any intention on the part of Curius, for it was not his object to create beautiful scenery. A person who has seen that waterful, can no longer take any pleasure in that of the Rhine, near Schaffhausen. Every one knows the canal through the rock, for thousands of travellers visit the falls of Terni, and generally drive about a mile further to lake Lugo for the purpose of hearing the beautiful echo. I visited it accompanied by my friend Brandis; I knew what is generally known in Italy, though not so generally in Germany, that there is a cutting through the rock, and I said to our guide that I wanted to go up the canal as far as the lake. The man made difficulties, saying that it was not a road for gentlemen, but fit only for rustics. But I insisted on carrying out my plan, and we thus came to the canal which is cut through the rock at an immense depth. When the man observed that we were interested in it, he said, I will take you to see another curiosity, which no one goes to see, if the road is not too difficult for you. It was a Roman bridge, the existence of which was then altogether unknown: it consists of a single arch, and is a splendid work constructed of large blocks without any cement—a work like the cloacae; there can be no doubt that this bridge also is a work of Curius. It is not mentioned in any book of travel. The same guide told us that the people of Reate and Terni once had a law-suit about an aqueduct, and that the former applied to Cicero, and the latter to an advocate of the last century:[1] a remarkable instance of the manner in which legends arise.

The frontier of the Sabines proper extend from the Anio to the Apennines, and the people in that part are called simply the Sabines. Here we have to take into consideration the tradition, that they did not originally inhabit the country south of Reate, but that they overpowered the

[1] Il buon Braccio; *Hist. of Rome*, vol. iii. p. 415, note 713.

ancient inhabitants of the Ausonian race. In the early history of Rome, these Sabines are of great importance; they are one of the constituent elements of Rome, and the Sabine settlements on two of the Roman hills formed part of ancient Rome. Afterwards too they act a prominent part, for during the first sixty years after the expulsion of the kings Sabine wars are frequently mentioned. It is true, that history contains much that is apocryphal, but the fact that there were wars with the Sabines is certain, only we must not imagine that all the Sabines took part in them. We cannot suppose that the Sabines of Amiternum sent their troops to the Tiber, any more than we can assume that, during the Volscian wars, the more distant towns of the Volscian nation took part in them. After the time of the decemvirate, and perhaps even before, the Romans had established with them the same relation of isopolity, which had already existed in the third century, but had been broken up. It was then restored, perhaps even survived the Gallic calamity, and continued until 463, when M'. Curius conquered the Sabines. After this subjugation, we read in our meagre accounts *Sabinis civitas data est,* which is the *civitas sine suffragio.* At the end of the first Punic war, the Sabines were constituted as two tribes, whose names, Quirina and Velina, alone clearly show that they consisted of Sabines. From this it is generally inferred, that the whole nation then obtained the full franchise; but this supposition is inconsistent with what we read in Livy (xxviii. 45) about the preparations of Scipio. This passage is one of the most suggestive in regard to Roman affairs: I have often referred to it, and shall often have to return to it; it clearly shows, which towns had the Roman franchise, and which were only federate towns. Reate and Amiternum are there mentioned in the same relation as the Umbrians, Etruscans, Marsians, and Peligmians; they supported Scipio in his undertaking by voluntary contributions and by recruiting for him, which would not have been possible, if they had had the franchise.

Napoleon treated dependent nations far more severely than the French themselves, but the Romans were nobler in this respect, and as they were the rulers, they also considered themselves bound to make exertions which they did not expect from their subjects. In many respects it was far more advantageous to be a Roman ally than to be a Roman citizen. There were towns on which no demands were made until the end of a campaign, because it would have been contrary to their privilege; and the *coloniae maritimae* often became really impertinent in insisting upon their privileges.

I have little to say about the towns in the country of the Sabines proper. The most important among them are REATE and AMITERNUM, neither of which has a history of any consequence. It is said that there still exist considerable ruins of Amiternum, but I have not seen them. It was the birth-place of the historian Sallust. The fact that, during the seventh and eighth centuries, Roman authors arose in this as in the Oscan districts, is a proof how easy the transition from their language into the Latin must have been; not one Roman author arose in Etruria.

The other parts of the Sabine country are high and mountainous; they have a true Alpine character, with all the peculiar vegetation of the Alps; even Icelandic moss grows there. As to the constitution of the Sabines and their union into one state, nothing is known.

PICENUM.

The north of the country of the Sabines was occupied by the Sabellian tribe of the Picentians in the Marca Ancona, between Abruzzo, the frontier of the Sabines and Marrucinians, and the Aesis. Their country begins at the

heights on the other side of the Apennines, and slopes down to the Adriatic, being one of the most beautiful hilly countries; but it has already something of the character of northern Italy, and the air is not southern; olives, however, still grow there, though not of the same beauty, and they are of a different type. The air and atmosphere are nearly the same as in Lombardy. Picenum forms the boundary between Central and Northern Italy.

According to tradition, this country was originally inhabited by Pelasgians, and was taken possession of by the Sabellians at a later period, through a *ver sacrum.* Such emigrations took place in consequence of a vow made either in times of distress, or during the calamities of war; but sometimes also they were the consequence of over-population. The emigrants were always guided by divine signs, concerning which there existed special legends. The Cumaeans related that their ancestors had been guided by a dove flying before their ships; others were led by a bull (as Cadmus to Thebes), the Hirpinians by a wolf (*hirpus*), and the Picentians by a woodpecker (*pica*) which flew before them. Traces of a longer continuance of the earlier population in the country may still be distinctly recognised. In other respects those districts are obscure to us, because the history of the times in which they acted a part is so obscure, or rather is entirely lost to us. This is the case, e. g., with the Picentian war, which was related in the thirteenth book of Livy, and with the expeditions of Cn. Pompeius Strabo during the Social War.

ASCULUM, the capital of the Picentians, was a very large place, as, according to report, may still be seen from its ruins. The historical importance of this town belongs to the Social War, which broke out there; it was here that the first act of hostility against Rome was committed in a tumult which broke out in the theatre, and in which the Romans were murdered. The new fragments from Diodorus, discovered by A. Mai, throw some light upon these

events. The town was taken, and we may easily imagine what was the fate of a place whose inhabitants had imbrued their hands with the blood of the commissioners of the senate who were sent to reprimand them. Asculum was not destroyed, but its fate was probably like that of Capua. After that time a class of towns in Picenum are mentioned under the name of *praefecturae agri Piceni*, from which we may recognise that Cn. Pompeius Strabo deprived the Picentians of their municipal institutions, and constituted them in this new form. This also shows that the Italians did not gain the franchise as simply as we generally imagine.

The Picentians are said to have been a very populous nation. At the time of their subjugation, after the war with Pyrrhus, their number is stated to have been 360,000, which evidently comprises not those alone who were capable of bearing arms.

The most important town in that whole country is ANCONA, which is the Latin form of the name, the Greek being Ἀγκών. It is one of the latest Greek settlements, a truly Greek town, founded by Dionysius in the 100th Olympiad; but we do not know whether the colonists were Syracusan exiles, or colonists sent out by Dionysius according to a definite plan. I am inclined to believe that Dionysius himself established the colony. The latter period of the elder Dionysius and the first of the younger are obscure to us on account of the absence of a regular plan in the work of Diodorus: he sometimes becomes tired in following up a history which he has carried through a series of years with the greatest minuteness; he then passes away from it, and leaves it out altogether. There does not exist a more thoughtless writer than this Diodorus of Sicily. Ancona remained a Greek town for a long time, and continued at a very late period to be connected with Constantinople, whence in the twelfth century it placed itself under the protection of Manuel Comnenus against the emperor

Frederic I. Ancona is one of the very few ports on that coast of Italy, and Trajan increased this advantage by building the molo which still exists.

A people mentioned under the name of PRAETUTH bordered on Picenum; there is great uncertainty about them, and it is not clear, whether they were Sabines, or whether they belonged to the ancient Tyrrhenian population. The town of HADRIA, from which the sea derives its name, was situated there.

THE UPPER CONFEDERATION OF THE MARSIANS, PELIGNIANS, MARRUCINIANS, AND VESTINIANS.

THE four Sabine tribes of the upper confederation occupied the country from the hills, which form the watershed between the Liris and the Vulturnus, to the Adriatic. They formed together one confederate state, and their connection is repeatedly alluded to in our authorities, as, for example, in Polybius, where he enumerates the Italian contingents levied against the Cisalpine Gauls; and in Ennius where we read *Marsa manus, Peligna cohors, Vestina virum vis.* At the time when the Vestinians declared for the Samnites, and the Romans wished to overcome them by a sudden attack, Livy remarks that the Romans ought to have considered that, by attacking the Vestinians, they would also make the Marsians, Marrucinians, and Pelignians their enemies. They were united as a confederation, in the same manner as the Romans were united with the Latins and Hernicans. In regard to origin, they were the same as the far ruling Samnites, but in their political system they were entirely different from them. Once only, in the second Samnite war, they hesitated as to whether they should not join the Samnites against the Romans; but the latter

succeeded in preventing it. It was the consequence of the fatality by which the Romans were destined to become the rulers of Italy, that the Marsians began to move during the interval between the second and third Samnite war: it was then a piece of folly on their part, which they had reason bitterly to repent; they ought to have done so before, and to have joined the Samnites. They were subdued and had to submit to hard terms, though afterwards the Romans again placed them in an honorable position, in which they remained until the outbreak of the great Marsian or Social War. There existed various causes, why they separated themselves from the Samnites, so that the latter did not obtain the support which, had the others not been infatuated, ought to have been given to them. It has often been observed, that people of quite different religions do not hate one another as much as those belonging to different sects of the same religion, even though their differences should be slight, nay the more trifling the differences are, the bitterer is their hatred. Thus, e.g., in France the Jansenists and Jesuits, as they are called, are more embittered against each other, than either of them is against the Calvinists; the united and non-united Armenians are enraged against each other, though their difference is only a formal one not affecting their dogmas. The Samnites and the other tribes were one nation, but the Samnites had become great, and hence the unfortunate envy and jealousy of their less powerful kinsmen. This is the chief reason, why they formed friendship with the Romans. They had, however, another reason besides, which afforded them a specious pretext, and draws a veil over the odiousness of their conduct. They were mountaineers and a pastoral people, who, during winter, required pastures for their sheep which they sent down into the plains of Apulia. Now, the Romans had succeeded in attaching the Apulians to their interests and in establishing themselves in their country. Hence the nations that were not on friendly terms with Rome, were excluded from the winter pasture

in Apulia. If the Marsians and their confederates had entertained different sentiments, they would have resolved, in conjunction with the Samnites, to expel the Romans from Apulia, which might have been a matter of no great difficulty.

I have shown in the first volume of my Roman History, that these four tribes belonged to the Sabine race: in regard to the Pelignians it is clear from Ovid, and the scholiast on the Aeneid proves it in regard to the Marsians. Each of these four tribes was in its own territory sovereign and independent; each also may have been subdivided, but in their relation to foreign countries they formed one state. In speaking of their separation from the Samnites, I was obliged to mention their disgraceful faithlessness, but this does not detract from their worth in other respects. It is acknowledged on all hands, that on account of their extraordinary and antique simplicity and frugality, they belonged to the most respectable nations of Italy; these virtues were preserved there at a time when the other Italians had long sunk into degeneracy, and when the Romans had completely abandoned the severe manners of their ancestors. This is the praise bestowed upon them by Virgil and even by Juvenal; the latter may in his expressions be alluding to earlier poets, but he could not possibly have written in the manner in which he has done, unless at least a shadow of the ancient manners had been preserved there. They were at the same time extremely industrious; their country was for the most part mountainous; agriculture was indeed carried on in the valleys, but it was not very productive, and the greater part of the country was pasture land. They had no wealth; but their strength lay in their contentment. Their valour was not less celebrated than the simplicity of their manners, and this feature too procured them the greatest respect among all the Italian nations; thus Ovid boasts of the *miles Pelignus*, his countryman. The Romans had a proverb saying, that they never triumphed over them and never

without them. The former part of this saying may be an exaggeration, for there can be no doubt that they were conquered in the third Samnite war; it is possible, however, that no triumph over them was celebrated; Livy does not mention it, and the Triumphal Fasti of that period are lost.

The MARSIANS dwelt about lake *Fucinus* (Lago di Celano), which is as clear as crystal, and is formed by the confluence of small brooks and subterraneous springs; Virgil calls it *vitrea unda*, and elsewhere it is described as *pellucidus lacus*. There is no visible outlet of its waters; they rise at intervals of several years, and decrease again. It must discharge its waters somewhere by subterraneous passages, which, we do not know how, sometimes close and then open again. When these passages are closed, the lake rises, overflows its banks, and covers large and beautiful tracts of country. In order to prevent such devastations, the emperor Claudius attempted to construct an immense canal to the Liris. The first attempt, however, failed on account of the great distance; a second succeeded for a time, but the canal then became obstructed. Before the time of the French revolution, renewed efforts were made to restore it, as the lake was greatly increasing; but while I was in Italy it decreased, and afterwards continued to do so still more; more than a Roman mile of land has thus been left dry, whence we must infer that new outlets have been opened. Many interesting antiquities have been found there.

MARRUVIUM was the capital of the Marsians, who themselves were sometimes called after it *Marruii* or *Marruvii*. It was taken by the Romans and changed by them into a Roman colony; it is remarkable for being the northernmost town in those parts that has Cyclopean walls. Petit-Radel has inferred from this, that the Pelasgian race extended to those districts, but I cannot decide as to whether he is right or wrong. He has very confused ideas about the ancient nations, and is, therefore, little qualified to pronounce judgment; still, however, it is possible that he may be right.

The PELIGNIANS, the second tribe in the northern Sabellian confederation, are mentioned with the same praise as the Marsians. If we had Livy's work complete, we should know more of their valour than what is related about the Pelignian cohort in the second Samnite war. As it is, their greatest glory consists in having produced Ovid, not to acknowledge whose merits as a poet would be a sign of narrowmindedness or prejudice. He was a native of SULMO, which he calls *Peligni pars tertia ruris.* It would, therefore, seem that, as elsewhere in Italy the towns of the same tribe formed one community, so each country contained a number of places, representing a similar division. The country of the Pelignians accordingly was divided into three parts. The second town was CORFINIUM, which, in the Marsian war, became the capital of the Italicans under the name of *Italica.* It has now disappeared, but Sulmo still exists under the name of Sulmona.

The capital of the MARRUCINIANS was TEATE, which is at present only a small insignificant place; in ancient times it was great, as we must infer partly from statements in ancient authors, and partly from its ruins. The Teatine monks derive their name from the circumstance that their monastery was at Teate. We have a tolerable number of coins of this town. The family of the Asinii, especially Asinius Pollio, the most celebrated of them, were Marrucinians.

The VESTINIANS had no towns of any name, and seem to have been the weakest among the four tribes; it is either for this reason that they are least spoken of, or because they were inferior to the others in character and moral worth.

The Samnites.

The real name of this nation in Oscan was *Sauini* or *Savini*. On the denarii which were coined during the Social War, we read on the one side *Safinim*, a genitive plural, and on the other *C. Papi Mutil*, the name of the celebrated Samnite commander. The Papii were as important a Samnite gens as the Cornelii among the Romans. I will not decide whether the name *Safinim* applies to the Samnites alone or to the whole Sabellian race, as all the Sabellian tribes took part in the insurrection of the Social War. In Greek they are called Σαυνῖται, and their country Σαύνιον, formed from the same root as the Oscan name. Scylax of Caryanda, who, as you remember, lived at the time of Philip of Macedonia, says of the Samnites: διήκουσιν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης εἰς θάλασσαν, that is, from the upper to the lower sea. On the upper sea we find the Frentanians whom Strabo reckons among the Samnites; Samnites also were the ruling people in the country about Herculaneum, Pompeii, and the cape of Minerva as far as the frontiers of Lucania. If we follow the traces which occur in Livy, the country of the Samnites is more extensive also in the north and south than we find it in our maps, even those of D'Anville. It here becomes very manifest how insufficient a single map is to form correct boundary lines. Thus Samnium, in the map of D'Anville, whom I name here only *honoris causa*, is quite unsatisfactory; there ought to be a whole series of Maps to show the different boundaries at different times. The geography of towns, however, may be studied from a single map. It is utterly impossible for a man attentively studying ancient history with D'Anville's map before him, to form a clear notion of Samnium. Its extent in that map does not refer to any particular time at all, though it answers most to the Augustan region of that name, but it does not it exactly represent either. According to Livy,

the Apulians, when pressed by the Samnites, threw themselves into the arms of the Romans; the Samnites had captured Luceria and conquered several places in the Apulian high lands, nay, they had extended their possessions as far as Venusia and Acheruntia, but were repelled by the victorious Romans. In the west, too, we meet with Samnites; Fregellae had been taken by them from the Volscians, but was afterwards likewise taken possession of by the Romans. In like manner we find Sora, and even Casinum, in the hands of the Samnites. The case of the latter town is mentioned by an author in whose work we should hardly look for it, and yet it is a statement which ought not to escape the notice of an historian. The historical inquirer must also examine the grammarians whose works contain facts of the greatest historical importance in fragments and accidental quotations. Such is the case, e.g., in the commentary of Servius and the scholiast on Juvenal;[1] it is, however, not only in writers of this class and in Festus that we may expect historical statements, but we find them in the authors of real grammars, such as Nonius, Diomedes, and Priscian; they contain much that is of value and ought not to be despised. Such also is the case here, for it is Varro who, in his work "De Lingua Latina,"[2] states, that Casinum was inhabited by Samnites. Hence we see that they extended as far as the neighbourhood of Arpinum and Monte Cassino, and that they had subdued the whole district between the upper Vulturnus and the upper Liris. It was, therefore, for the purpose of extending their dominion in that part, that they undertook the war against the Sidicines.

The Samnites, as we have seen, did not form a compact nation, they were not united by one capital, they had no

[1] "I mean the ancient one, whose scholia have now been discovered; for there also is another scholiast belonging to the middle ages, who is imperfect and bad, and belongs to the period of decay. The ancient one lived at the best period of Latin grammarians."

[2] vii. 29 ed. Müller.

permanent government to keep the whole together, and they formed no *civitas*, but a *populus*, not a πόλις, but an ἔθνος. They consisted of four or five different tribes, which were not more closely united with one another than the Romans, Latins, and Hernicans, or even not more closely than the Romans, Latins, and Volscians of Ecetrae were at various times. Thus it happened that the Frentanians, though a Samnite people, concluded, during the second Samnite war, a separate peace with Rome and allowed her armies a passage through Abruzzo into Apulia. Velleius Paterculus states, that on one occasion the Romans were defeated by the Caudines alone, and in the Triumphal Fasti we read, that a general triumphed *de Samnitibus omnibus praeter Pentros*. So long as the Romans stood on a footing of equality with the Latins and Hernicans, the Samnites were able to keep them within due bounds; but when they themselves had assisted the Romans in reducing the Latins to the condition of subjects, the compactness of the Roman state was against them, and they were no longer equally matched. No wonder, therefore, that they succumbed to the Romans; but it is surprising to find that, after all, they were able to hold out in a struggle like the second Samnite war, which lasted twenty-four years and a half. And notwithstanding this, they rose again with the force of despair, which hopes for nothing and destroys its own existence.

We must conceive each Samnite tribe to have had its own senate, from which deputies were elected to deliberate on common affairs, as the Romans and Latins did at the Feriae Latinae. In this manner the Samnite praetors and imperators met, perhaps with deputies and the heads of the senate (*decem primi*).

Samnium, in this extended sense, is a country presenting very different aspects. The part extending on the coast from Herculaneum as far as the Silarus, belongs, according to its physical features, most decidedly to southern Italy; I will not say that it is essentially a Hellenic country, but it

is like a Hellenic, it is a Tyrrhenian country. It had originally a Tyrrhenian population, though it was governed by Samnites, and at an earlier period probably by Oscans. In the interior, we have the Apennines, a very beautiful mountain country with some very fertile valleys, and on the whole such as we generally understand by a mountainous region. The hills nowhere rise to the height of the Abruzzi, and nowhere beyond the limits of vegetation; they are woody mountains, and the forests are for the most part still preserved. The country of the Frentanians is hilly, and in no way remarkable.

The Samnite tribes were distributed in the following manner:—The FRENTANIANS dwelt on the other side of the Apennines as far as the Adriatic. The PENTRIANS were the northernmost tribe in the interior, between the country of the Pelignians and the neighbourhood of Beneventum; their capital was Bovianum. In the south of them we have the CAUDINES, who unquestionably possessed the whole district about the river Calor, a tributary of the Vulturnus, and Beneventum. The HIRPINIANS dwelt still farther south, between the Caudines, Lucanians, and Apulians. On the south-west of the Hirpinians the coast district extended from mount Vesuvius to the river Silarus; the Samnites of this last district, as I have already observed, are not known to us under any certain ethnic name, though it is probable that they may have been called *Alfaterni* or *Alfaterini*.

In maps you will find in that district where Salernum was situated, the name *Picentia* or *Picentini*; but this name does not belong to the early times. Strabo says that they were transplanted thither as an ἀποδασμὸς of the Picentini on the upper sea. This must have taken place before the Hannibalian war, for at that time the Picentians were among the nations which rose against Rome. This is not the place for entering into minute discussions, I will only state, as the result of my inquiries, that this happened after the Samnite wars. When the Romans conquered that

district and found it greatly depopulated, they transplanted the Picentini thither for the purpose of preventing the communication of the Samnites with the lower sea; for they might obtain assistance from the Tarentines, with whom they were on terms of friendship. By the same means, the very enterprising Agathocles, who would have liked to gain a firm footing in southern Italy, was kept away from that coast. The communication with the Lucanians, who were allied with Rome during the second and third war, also was kept open in this manner; and it was of great importance to Rome to maintain this connection.

Among the Frentanians there is no town worth mentioning.

Among the Pentrians we have BOVIANUM, which appears in Roman history at first as a great place; but all Samnite towns of the interior had this feature in common, that they were, properly speaking, not fortified. This circumstance has led to a foolish assertion which occurs in the writings of some of the ancients, though men like Strabo did not believe it. The friendship subsisting between the Samnites and Tarentines gave rise to a wish among the former to be regarded as kinsmen of the Tarentines, and hence the fancy that the Samnites were a Lacedaemonian colony. This singular notion was then supported by accidental circumstances, as for example, by the fact that the Samnite towns were open places. There is in reality no trace of a truly fortified town in all Samnium; but the case of those towns which the Samnites conquered beyond their own frontiers is of course different. The Samnite towns were situated on hills, the sides of which were cut precipitously; and such a situation may at first have been sufficient; but it was of no avail against bold and daring enemies like the Romans, who attacked a place, *cingebant corona*, and then stormed it by means of ladders. The consequence was, that Bovianum and other towns, when the Romans were masters of the country around, offered no resistance, but were scaled and devastated. But they soon rose again,

though with smaller houses and of less extent. During the Samnite wars, Bovianum was destroyed three or four times in the course of a few years; and hence we may form some idea as to the condition in which it must have been. But notwithstanding all this, we again find it as a respectable town at the period of the Hannibalian war; in that of Sulla it was entirely destroyed; and he sent a military colony into the place, because he wanted to punish it, but did not rebuild it on its ancient site; the new town he founded in the neighbourhood of the old one was called *Bovianum Undecumanorum.* In like manner, he did not restore Faesulae, but founded Florentia, at some distance on the river Arnus. At Arretium he followed the same system. At present, Bovianum is quite an insignificant place; it occupies the site of the Roman and not of the Samnite town. From this one example, you may infer the fate of all the Samnite towns: many of them, the conquest of which is mentioned by Livy in his ninth and tenth books, entirely disappear from the earth, so that they are not mentioned either by Pliny or by Ptolemy. The country is at present full of towns and villages, but very few of their names are indicative of their ancient origin. In all Samnium there is not a single ruin belonging to the period preceding the Roman dominion. I have not been there, but Count Zurlo, a Samnite by birth, who has examined his own country very carefully, has assured me that, with the exception of the few Samnite denarii and some copper coins, no antiquities older than the Roman dominion are found in all Samnium, from the extreme frontier of the Pentrians to that of the Hirpinians; nor are there any tombs which are of such frequent occurrence in Campania. But it could not have been otherwise, for the Romans systematically destroyed everything in that country; otherwise such an utter disappearance of everything would be unaccountable: both during the third Samnite war and in that of Sulla, the Romans attempted to extirpate the whole nation. Strabo says that only ἴχνη πόλεων ἀμαυρὰ were left; and as the nation so

also its language disappeared. Such was the revenge Sulla took for the battle at the Colline gate! He not only butchered the prisoners of war, but after having become master of Italy, he rooted out the whole population.

In the country of the Pentrians, there are a few places, especially on the west of the Vulturnus, concerning which it is doubtful whether they were properly Samnite, that is, belonging to the Pentrians, or whether they were Oscan towns conquered by the Samnites. Places of this kind are ALLIFAE and AQUINUM[1], a large town on the Via Latina and a praefectura Romana, that is, it had the Roman franchise before its being conferred upon all the Italians, but the administration was in the hands of a Roman praefectus. Aquinum was the birth-place of the great poet Juvenal. A third town was AESERNIA, which, after the third Samnite war, became a Roman colony.

Previously to the second Samnite war, the dominion of the Samnites extended over the whole district between the upper Liris and the Vulturnus. They had occupied Casinum and Fregellae, and the second war broke out, because the Romans wanted to fortify Fregellae for the purpose of protecting their own frontier against the Samnites. The letter of the treaty in this instance was at variance with reason, for the Samnites in possession of Fregellae might have become dangerous to Rome herself.

BENEVENTUM was the most important place in central Samnium, although there can be no doubt that Caudium gave its name to the people. The Romans changed the name of the town because of its ominous meaning; for it is said to have formerly been called *Maleventum*. But Maleventum or Maluentum is not a Latin word at all, but has its origin in the Greek *Μαλοῦς*, *Μαλόεις*, Apple-town. This name too, therefore, shows that Itali (Siculi) dwelt there before the Oscans. Salmasius, in his "Exercitationes Plinianae" (a book of which we may well say, *φάρμακα πολλὰ*

[1] "Pronounce *Arpīnum*, but *Arimĭnum*; I say this, because I have heard many otherwise good scholars say *Arimīnum*."

μὲν ἐσθλὰ μεμιγμένα, πολλὰ δὲ λυγρά), first drew attention to the etymology of Maleventum. The whole plan of that book is beneath criticism; it is a real chaos, and we cannot help being vexed at the careless haste with which he has put together the most erroneous opinions. But it contains much information culled from writers which are otherwise not often read. Salmasius is unfortunate in his emendations, in mythology and grammar he is bad, though sometimes he makes a very good remark, as e.g., on the subject now under our consideration. In the history of the Samnite wars, Beneventum is but rarely mentioned, whence it would seem that it was then still an insignificant place. But the Romans conquered it, and after the third Samnite war established a colony there, as they generally did *in locis opportunis*; and by means of this colony they in reality broke the power of Samnium. After this time Beneventum maintained itself by the side of the sinking Samnite towns, and was of great importance to the Romans in the Social War. Under the empire it was a very considerable provincial town, whence there are few places of which such splendid ruins are extant; among others we there have a triumphal arch of Trajan.

CAUDIUM, on the road from Capua to Beneventum, must once have been a considerable town, because it gave its name to the people. As a town, however, it is scarcely mentioned, and only Horace in his journey to Brundusium speaks of *Caudi cauponae*. This is one of the instances which we have seen before in the case of Gabii, Fidenae, and others: on the site of destroyed places afterwards new ones arose out of inns which were built at stations on the high-roads. Several Samnite places, which are mentioned in Livy, but of which the sites cannot be ascertained, may have been situated there. We can scarcely form conjectures about them.

The third Samnite tribe, or, including the Frentanians, the fourth, are the HIRPINIANS, in the district of the modern Avellino, inhabiting one of the most beautiful hilly

countries, between Beneventum, Lucania, and Salernum. It possesses extraordinary advantages over the northern part of the territory of Naples in regard to climate, for it is a perfectly southern country, although its heights are not inconsiderable: its capital was COMPSA, about which I have nothing particular to relate; it was one of the towns that joined Hannibal, and after having already suffered greatly during a previous conquest, it was completely razed to the ground somewhere between the seventh and tenth year of the war. But as it was afterwards rebuilt, the Romans nevertheless restored its independence. During the Social War it made common cause with the Samnite nation.

The really Greek portion of the Samnite territory is about the cape of Minerva from Surrentum to Salernum. On the ridge of this part, between mount Vesuvius and Salernum, we have NUCERIA, a very large and flourishing town, the wealth and character of which are attested by its extremely beautiful silver coins, which are in no way inferior to those of Greece.

I have already mentioned *Pompeii* and *Herculaneum* in speaking of Campania. SURRENTUM is well known as one of the most enchanting places on the whole face of the earth. Although the ancients were not as enthusiastic in their admiration of beautiful scenery as the moderns, still even among them it was celebrated as a place of indescribable charms.

The coast on the bay of Salernum was occupied by the PICENTINI, whom I have already mentioned, and whom the Romans had transplanted thither from Picenum after the Samnite wars. In the earliest times, a great number of Tyrrhenian places existed on that bay, from which it is evident that there was in that part a considerable Pelasgian population, which, though subdued, maintained itself for a long time.

SALERNUM was not a place of great importance in antiquity, but in the history of the middle ages it is celebrated as the place of residence of the Lombard kings. Until the

Hannibalian war, Salernum and the surrounding country belonged to the Campanians, for the Romans appeased their allies of those places on which they had conferred the franchise without the suffrage, by ceding domain lands to them. Afterwards Salernum became a Roman colony. The river Silarus formed the boundary between that part of Samnium and Lucania.

On the coast of the most southern part of Samnium, AMALFI arose as a flourishing republic at an early period of the middle ages, during the time of the Lombards. The local belief is, that Amalfi was a Roman colony of the imperial period. For reasons which we can easily imagine, the opinion became established, that Constantine had led a Roman colony to Constantinople; and at Amalfi a tradition sprang up, that a fleet with Roman colonists, destined for Byzantium, was wrecked on that coast, or compelled by adverse winds to land, and that the colonists then established themselves there. This whole story is neither more nor less credible than so many others about colonies which were said to have been founded by the heroes returning from Troy. Amalfi is never before mentioned, and became important at the time when the Lombards conquered the interior of the country, and pushed the inhabitants towards the coast; the people naturally called themselves Romans as opposed to Lombards and barbarians. The town, like Naples, was under the direct protection of Constantinople, and was altogether non-barbarian; it belonged to the class of free cities, which had preserved a free Roman municipal constitution, and was very different from the free cities which arose under German laws.

Apulia.

The name Apulia, no doubt, signifies the country of the *Apuli*. *Apulus* is of the same formation as *Romulus*, the same as *Romanus*, just as *Graeculus* is the same as *Graecus*, etc. Accordingly, *Apulus*, *Apus*, and *Apicus*, and with a change of vowel, *Opicus*, are identical. The Oscan language has the letter *p* where the Latin has *qu* (pronounced as *k*), and just as in the Greek dialects π and κ are interchangeable. *Apulus*, therefore, is in no way different from *Aequi*, *Aequuli*, *Aequani*. If we attentively trace the dialects, there is scarcely any nation which admits such great changes in them as the Oscan. It is a very correct and ancient law of logic, "principia praeter necessitatem non esse multiplicanda," and in the history of ancient nations, too, it ought not to be lost sight of. It certainly is true, that sometimes we recognise the existence of many quite different nations living close to one another—in the Caucasus and in America, there are districts of not many square miles, in which great numbers of languages are spoken, that do not bear the slightest resemblance to one another; and in like manner essentially different nations dwell side by side in a portion of Africa—but we, nevertheless, cannot adopt such lists of nations as are given by the ancients, for they are not rationally arranged, and are often without any meaning at all. The ancients had no interest in forming accurate notions on such points; when they dwelt upon inquiries of this kind, matters became almost worse: they then wrote thoughtlessly, putting down things as essentially different, which seemed to present ever so slight a difference, and treating as identical those which were really different. There does not exist a more singular mass of confusion than in Pliny's account of the different nations. I know from experience, how many stages a man has to pass through before he arrives at positive certainty upon such questions. Garve very truly says,

"the second is the beginning." A person assuming that in Italy everything was originally different, feels as if a wheel were spinning round in his head; and he soon arrives at the conviction that his supposition has no meaning, and gives up the whole matter in despair. I have experienced this same thing, but did not rest until I arrived at a definite result. The subject does not suffer from its being confused: many things are treated with scorn, merely because they are abused; if things were not represented in a false light, there would be no danger of things deserving attention ever being scorned. But it does happen, when things are erroneously conceived, and are defended with obstinacy, when they cannot be defended at all. It is the sad but natural consequence of such a defence of what is opposed to reason and truth, that many men despise even that which is deserving of consideration. Hence so many follies. A fancy of this kind during the period of my youth, was the belief in perfectibility, when people imagined that in every respect they were far above their ancestors. But it is an equally great folly unconditionally to praise our ancestors, and to forget that there is an endless number of points in which we move sometimes forward and sometimes backward. The question whether an entire period is superior or inferior to another, is of a very different nature, and one which it is difficult to answer, if it is put in a rational way. I should least of all wish to exchange the present time for the middle ages, which fools only praise as the happiest era in history. There can be no doubt that in the middle ages life was more intense, sympathies were stronger, and activity was more vigorous; but our age has other advantages, and our progress in science especially is immense. When I compare the moral condition of our age with what it was a hundred or a hundred and twenty years ago, I cannot hesitate for a moment, with a full knowledge of all the facts, to say that our age, not only in Germany, but even in France, is infinitely better.

He, therefore, is the true friend of antiquity who disen-

tangles it from its confusion and places it in its true light. The ancients knew but little about the nations of Italy, and later writers, especially Pliny, knew no more, so that we cannot even discern how far Cato saw clearly in this matter, and how far not. He still recognised that the Aborigines of Latium belonged to a race akin to the Greeks, a fact which Varro no longer understood. From Fabius down to Cato and Pliny, the knowledge of the early history of Italy decreased more and more.

As all names of countries are derived from those of nations, as *Italia* from *Itali*, *Graecia* from *Graeci*, so *Apulia* is formed from *Apuli*. Pliny says that there were *tria genera Apulorum*: 1. *Apuli Teani*; 2. *Daunii*; and 3. *Apuli Lucani*. From Strabo, we see that the real Apulians dwelt in the north-west of Apulia as far as the river Cerbalus: these are the Oscans. But the Daunians were Itali, dwelling at Arpi (Argyrippa), a Greek town, and at Canusium. They are put in connection with the Tyrrhenians, Turnus (the same as Turinus) being called a son of Daunus. The Daunians in Apulia, therefore, are the ancient Tyrrheno-Pelasgian inhabitants of that country, akin to the Peucetians, who were likewise regarded by the Greeks as Pelasgians. The Oscans, who did not maintain themselves in their conquests in Samnium, rose to power in Apulia, and the Daunians remained in the country as the subject people. The *Apuli Lucani* are, doubtless, nothing else than portions of Apulia, which were peopled either by Lucanians or by Samnites, and, therefore, at all events, by a Sabellian race; in these parts, the ancient Itali were governed by them, so that a Samnite-Oscan population was the ruling people, whose subjects originally consisted, for the most part, of Itali, with whom, however, some Oscans also may have been mixed. Whether these Lucanians had proceeded from the already constituted nation of the Lucanians, or directly from Samnium, is a question which can no longer be answered. The chaos is, I hope, cleared up by this explanation. Apulia furnishes rich materials for ethnography, and far more

than Samnium which is otherwise a much more splendid country.

Apulia has the form of a theatre (Greek geographers would call it θεατροειδές). The Greeks called it Iapygia, though this name embraces a greater extent of country, all Messapia and Calabria being included, so that Tarentum also belonged to Iapygia. The name *Iapyx* again is only a dialectic variety of *Apulus*. The Latin termination *icus* is in Oscan *ix*, as we see in *Meddix Tutix*, the title of the highest magistrate, which the Romans changed into *Maddix Tuticus*: hence *Iapicus*=*Apicus*=*Opicus*. When I repeatedly direct your attention to view this point rightly, I do not do so from distrust, but because I know, from my own experience, how difficult it is to make up one's mind to believe that Iapygia and Apulia are the same name. I myself have long been mistaken about this, and did not see the truth until I became familiar with the remains of the Oscan language, and was thus enabled to establish the etymology.

Apulia is surrounded by a semicircle of not very high hills, beginning with mount Garganus on the Adriatic, continued by the chain of the Apennines, and then separating Apulia from Samnium and Lucania. Afterwards this range terminates in low hills towards Terra di Lecce. The inner part of the semicircle, containing the thymele, orchestra, and stage, is formed by the plain of Apulia, a chalk country, like Champagne or the kingdom of Leon in Spain. It is, however, not a perfect plain, but has small elevations (*verrucae*); it has very few rivers, the springs not being able to break through the ground. As the chalk lies in strata, the waters are drawn down towards a few rivers, which traverse the plains without being fed by tributaries, just like the Minho and Douro in the kingdom of Leon, and the Aisne, Marne, and Seine in Champagne. The AUFIDUS is a very powerful river, its bed is cut very deep; in summer its water is low, but during the winter every shower of rain swells it immensely. The plain through

which it flows is a barren chalk-field; water is found there by boring very deep wells, so that the country requires much rain. After a good rain in the autumn, the land covers itself with excellent and extremely rich grass. In some parts where irrigation is possible, where the soil is a little mixed, and where it is carefully tilled by man, the country is excellent for growing corn, which ripens at an extremely early season. An intimate friend of mine at Naples was intendant of Apulia, and from him I learned that the harvest of wheat in Apulia takes place about the end of May, that is, three weeks earlier than at Athens, where the 20th of June is the harvest season, a fact which it is of importance to know in reading Thucydides, who often describes the season of the year by mentioning the harvest-time. About the foot of the hills, Apulia is altogether barren, at least at present, but I cannot say whether the same was the case in antiquity. The country is now for many miles covered with nothing but ferula and ferns.

Western Apulia, which Pliny calls by the name of *Teani Apuli*, the country of the real and genuine Apulians, is of very little importance in history. The towns of Apulia mentioned in history, belong to the Daunians. Apulia was not a politically united country, it presents even less of national unity than Samnium, for it contained several systems of towns which were quite independent of, and even hostile to, one another. Arpi and Canusium were the most important towns, and the others seem to have been grouped around them.

ARPI, in Greek, *Ἀργυρίππα*, shows by its name its Pelasgian origin; it is the same as Argos. Some indeed call it *Ἄργος Ἵππιον*, but this name occurs but rarely, and it is doubtful whether it is a genuine ancient name, or whether it arose from later etymological speculations. Arpi was the first place that joined the Romans. All the Apulian coins have Greek inscriptions; those of Arpi bear the inscription *ΑΡΠΑΝΩΝ*, but in point of artistic execution,

they are not quite Greek, and those who have eyes for such things cannot fail to discover a peculiar character. Other works of art also have been dug out of the ground in Apulia, and those who have practised eyes do not find it difficult to distinguish bronzes of Apulia from those of Lucania. Those of Apulia are extremely beautiful in their way, but still have something strange about them. In the days of Strabo it was still possible to perceive, from the vast circumference of the walls, that Arpi had once been a large place, but it was deserted. You cannot conceive a greater contrast than that between Samnium and Apulia: in the latter country all the towns were fortified with walls and other works, while in Samnium they were protected by nature against hostile attacks. The fidelity of Arpi during the second Samnite war was rewarded by the Romans with large possessions, but in the Hannibalian war it received its fatal blow. At present it has entirely disappeared. Apulia has, on the whole, very few ruins, which is the consequence of the soft chalk-stone, of which all monuments were made, and which cannot stand against the influence of the weather.

We should not believe that CANUSIUM was a town of such importance, were it not expressly attested by Strabo, that Apulia was divided between Arpi and Canusium. In Livy, it appears as an insignificant place. We may also infer from Strabo, that during the second Samnite war, it was at the head of the Apulian towns which had joined the Samnites, while Arpi sided with the Romans. After the battle of Cannae, the Romans, by an inconceivable carelessness on the part of Hannibal, were enabled almost under his very arrows to retreat to the walls of Canusium, where they rallied and then proceeded to Venusia. In the second Punic war, Canusium does not appear to have been hostile to Rome; in the Samnite war, as I have already observed, it supported the Samnites, but the whole country afterwards submitted to the Romans on terms which were by no means unfavourable. Still, however, they revolted

during the war with Pyrrhus: it cannot be accurately traced what influence this step had on their fate. The town suffered severely in consequence of both its revolt from Rome and from the hostility of the Carthaginians, and the Apulian towns did not easily recover after being once destroyed. In the time of Strabo, it was a deserted place, large walls enclosing a number of decayed houses. In this light the town also appears in Horace's journey to Brundusium. It is now called Canosa.

SIPONTUM and SALAPIA belonged to the territory of Arpi. The name Sipontum (Σιποῦς) betrays its Tyrrhenian origin. All these places suffered severely during the Hannibalian war. When the Romans punished Arpi for its revolt, they deprived it of the dominion over these towns, and sent a colony to Sipontum. The neighbourhood of Sipontum is a salt plain and therefore unhealthy.

LUCERIA was situated on the height between Arpi and Beneventum. It was an Apulian town, but was captured by the Samnites, as I have clearly ascertained, and was afterwards taken from them by the Romans, and changed into a Romano-Latin colony. The establishment of this colony in so distant a country is one of the bold measures of the Romans, whereby, after the long struggle, in which even the greatest exertions proved unsuccessful, they decided the final issue of their war against the Samnites.

VENUSIA was another great creation of the Romans; it is uncertain whether it belonged to Apulia or Lucania, but it was situated at the foot of mount Vultur, which is probably the Oscan word for mountain in general. It was likewise a Romano-Latin colony, founded after the third Samnite war by the Romans, who were then on friendly terms with the Lucanians and ruled over Apulia. By this colony they prepared their future undertaking against Tarentum, as by it they completely cut off the communication between the Samnites and that city. In a fragment of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the Excerpta of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the Romans are said to

have sent 20,000 colonists to Venusia, that is 20,000 families, or at least 20,000 men capable of bearing arms: this number is incredible, there must be a mistake here. By admitting the neighbouring Oscan and Lucanian people, Venusia must, in the course of time, have become much estranged from Rome, for, during the Social War, it was the only colony which, according to a statement in Appian, rose against Rome. From the expressions of Horace it may be inferred, that afterwards it became one of the military colonies of Caesar.[1] The town will ever be memorable as the birth-place of Horace.

Having thus gone through Apulia in the Roman sense, we shall proceed in a south-eastern direction to the people of the POEDICULI or PEUCETII. The name is a double derivative, as we often see in ethnic names, e.g., in Aequiculi; the simple form was no doubt Poedi, though it does not occur anywhere. The people themselves are not mentioned in Roman history; we find them in a state of subjection, but do not see when they fell into that condition; their name is not mentioned in the Triumphal Fasti; and the struggle with them cannot have been great. The name Poediculi appears to be very different from Peucetii, and yet the difference consists only in a transposition of the letters. It is attested and generally acknowledged, that the two names belong to the same people; they are called by the Greeks Pelasgians, and belonged to the same race as the Oenotrians, together with whom they are placed on a level with the Thesprotians, Epirots, and Arcadians. This is, in fact, quite natural, for as the Daunians were of this race, the Peucetians, living still nearer to Greece, certainly belonged to it.

BARIUM, the most important place among the Peucetii, occupies no prominent position in ancient history; but in the middle ages, it was the seat of the Byzantine governors (Capitani) of southern Italy: its present name is Bari. The physical nature of the country of the Peucetii is very

[1] Comp. *Lect. on Rom. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 138.

remarkable; it is still the same chalk soil as in Apulia, but it has here the peculiarity of constantly forming saltpetre: there is no place in Europe that bears any resemblance to it. There are large holes in the ground in the shape of funnels, in which the saltpetre is collected: this phenomenon is extremely remarkable, showing the formative tendency of mineral nature. The country, though without water and dry, is not really barren, but still the want of water has its great disadvantages. The Terra d'Otranto (Terra di Lecce), or the Iapygian headland, however, which projects farther into the sea, is a much more fertile and favoured country; it has indeed the same physical conformation, but the upper stratum does not exclude the water; it is richer in springs, and accordingly more fertile. For the cultivation of olives, it is the most excellent country in the world, but it is not suited for first class wines. The olive-tree grows very well with less moisture, and even at this day it is very excellent there, although the art of cultivating it has sunk very low. It was in vain that I requested the papal government to add to the plants in the botanic garden which are cultivated for ordinary use, those also which are of interest to the scholar. At Naples something has been done for the cultivation of olives, and many things which have been handed down from antiquity may still be recognised. The Iapygian headland is a beautiful hilly country, covered all over with olive plantations. The olive is not a handsome tree, nearly resembling a willow; its varieties, however, like those of the vine, are very numerous; it spreads very rapidly, and is almost imperishable, as if Minerva had given it immortality. It is said that near Tivoli it lives a thousand years, though no one can prove it; but certain it is, that it can live several hundred years: it then becomes quite hollow, like a willow, and continues its life through its bark. At this stage its fruit is most perfect, but the root of the tree requires the greatest care, and to prevent the tree being thrown down by the winds, the root must be covered with a great

quantity of soil. All agriculture in Italy is still the same as in antiquity, and as we find it described in the "Scriptores Rei Rusticae;" you may still see every point as described by Varro.

MESSAPIA

had a somewhat greater extent than the present Terra di Lecce. The ancient Greek name is *ἀκτὴ Ἰαπυγία*. It is a beautiful hilly country, but its geography is in a singular predicament. The name Messapii is only once mentioned by the Romans, and that in the Triumphal Fasti; but we know from Strabo, that Messapia was inhabited by two different nations, the Messapians and Calabrians; and from other authorities we learn that the inhabitants of Brundusium were Calabrians. In the course of time, the name Calabria became established among the Romans for the whole of Messapia. It is remarkable, however, to find, that in the middle ages the name was transferred to Lucania and Bruttium, whereas Calabria Proper ceased to have this name. The explanations given of this singular change are unsatisfactory.

The inhabitants of the western side of this Acte were the SALLENTINES, while the eastern coast, from the Iapygian promontory to Brundusium, was occupied by CALABRIANS. The strangest traditions are current about the origin of the Sallentines: they are sometimes called Bottiaeans and sometimes Cretans; in short, they share the character of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian nations. But were the Calabrians of the same race? I believe not, and am rather inclined to think that they were immigrating and conquering Oscans; for the fact, that Ennius of Rudiae in Calabria calls Oscan and Greek his mother tongues, shows that, during the Roman period, Oscan was spoken there. All the towns in

those parts were δίγλωσσοι, that is, they spoke Tyrrhenian and Oscan. In like manner, the Albanese spoke both Greek and Albanese, as had formerly been the case with the Albanese at Argos and in Hydra. So also every man in the towns of upper Silesia, who makes any pretence to education, and even in rural districts, speaks German, although the national language is Polish. At Ragusa, all respectable persons, both nobles and commoners, speak Italian and Slavonian. A priest of Ragusa, who was a dear friend of mine, told me, that the little children at school do not commence by learning Slavonian, but Latin and Italian, and that all books are written in Italian, which language is explained to the children while they learn. The educated classes in Corfu speak Italian quite perfectly, and as correctly as it is spoken in Tuscany.

As we know that Brundusium arose after the expulsion of the Pelasgian inhabitants, it seems beyond a doubt that the Calabrians formed the last train of the Oscan immigrants who came from the north through Apulia. The oracles which are said to refer to this country, have no authority whatever; they all belong to the period of Timaeus, or are but little older than his age.

There must have once been a town of the name of Σαλλοῦς or Sallentum, from which the name of the Sallentines is derived. The existence of such a town has, in fact, been assumed by many moderns, and those who have read "Telemachus" will remember that it is mentioned in that book. This is in reality correct, but the existence of the town cannot be historically proved: it must have perished at a very early period. In ancient times the Messapians were mortal enemies of the Tarentines, who had endeavoured to make them ἀνάστατοι; but the Messapians maintained their independence. When, centuries later, circumstances were changed, and the neighbours had come in closer contact, Messapia placed itself under the protection of Tarentum.

The towns in the country of the Messapians are un-

important; there still exist very beautiful ruins, especially a fine temple on the Iapygian headland; and in the neighbourhood of Manduria a complete wall still exists. The two most important towns were Hydruntum and Brundusium.

HYDRUNTUM (Ὕδρους), now Otranto, had probably Tarentine epoeci, by whom it was hellenised. It was a place of great consequence, being the point from which people sailed across to Apollonia and Oricus, as now people sail from Calais to Dover. Hydruntum retained this character until the Norman period, and as long as southern Italy was connected with the eastern empire.

BRUNDUSIUM was distinguished for its excellent harbour, which was valued the more because there was not a single good harbour between Brundusium and Ancona. It consisted of several branches, and could admit more ships than ever sailed in those seas. For this reason the Romans secured the possession of that town as early as possible, and established a Latin colony there. At present the harbour is partly filled up with mud.

ANCIENT OENOTRIA.

The Oenotrians in southern Italy are the real Itali. I shall speak of them first, and after having put them in their right light, I shall pass on to the Greek towns on the the coasts, which are commonly called Magna Graecia.

Oenotria is the same as Italia in the limited sense of the name. You remember the varying circumstances, according to which the name Italia was given to a larger or smaller extent of country, and that in its widest sense it embraced the country as far as the Tiber and mount Garganus. In consequence of the extension of other nations, the Itali

were afterwards confined to the southern country, and thereby became so compact, that they were wholly governed by the Greek colonies on the coast, and hence when, e. g, a person went from Sybaris to Posidonia, or from Croton to Terina, he had to pass, if not through a country altogether peopled by Greeks, at least through one governed by Greek towns. Oenotria thus became Italy proper; but it cannot be said, on the other hand, that the name Italia was transferred from that small district to the whole of the peninsula. If we were confined to the Roman writers alone, and if we had no information from Greek authors, especially Dionysius and Strabo, we should be in utter ignorance about the Oenotrians, and we should scarcely have any idea of Italian archaeology. From this we may infer how much more information must be lost about more distant countries, which had no literature of their own. The Lucanians, whom we afterwards find spread over the whole of that country, occupied, at the period of the Persian wars, only the north-eastern portion of Lucania, while all the rest of the country afterwards called Lucania, and the whole of Bruttium, were inhabited by Oenotrians. On the coast, Greek colonies were established, which ruled over them as sovereigns, so that the greater part of the Oenotrians were reduced to a state of servitude, but another portion of them was never subdued. These Oenotrians were Pelasgians or Siceli of the same stock as the Epirots, as is stated by the scholiast on the Odyssey, on the authority of the Macedonian Mnaseas, the disciple of Aristarchus. *Siceli* and *Itali* are the same, as was recognised even by the ancients; the names are also etymologically identical, *Italus* being the same as *Vitulus*, the sibilant taking the place of the digamma. In a narrower sense, the name Siculi was applied to the Oenotrians, the inhabitants of the southernmost part of Italy. It is very strange to find that this very ancient mode of designation re-appears in the geography of the middle ages, for in the division of the Byzantine empire into provinces, the southernmost part of Italy was called

Sikelia. This is generally referred to the vanity of the Byzantine court, which is said to have been desirous to have a province called Sicily, after the island had been taken from it by the Arabs. This indeed is not impossible; but I believe it to be a very arbitrary conjecture, and am rather inclined to believe that the country, in ordinary life, still continued to be called Sikelia, as the earliest Italians were called Siceli by Thucydides and Timaeus (in Polybius). In this manner, the name was probably propagated, and this also seems to have been the origin of the strange appellation of "the two Sicilies," which at present is indeed quite absurd, but, in its origin, was probably quite intelligible.

Besides these Siceli, which, in some districts that can no longer be defined, were called *Italietes* and *Morgetes*, there existed in southern Italy yet another race of the Oenotrians, called CHAONIANS or CHONIANS. This name also re-appears in Epirus. The metropolis of the Chaonians was called *Chone*, and had been situated not far from Croton; it may have been destroyed by the Greeks.

In their state of dependence on the ancient Greek towns, these Oenotrians became completely hellenised. During the first century after the Greek settlements, they were not yet subdued, but they were reduced at the time when Sybaris and Croton had reached their highest prosperity. This is proved by the colonies of these two cities on the western coast, which oblige us to assume that the intermediate country was subject to them. Hence the almost fabulous accounts of the immense population of Sybaris and Croton, which must be understood to refer, not to the population of the cities alone, but also to comprise their subjects. The fall of Sybaris, in Olymp. 67, 3, was the death blow to the Greek dominion in southern Italy, and to the subjects who all lived in willing submission; for in the course of a long time a relation had arisen, in which the rule of Sybaris had become milder and milder, and in which the nations became more and more united with it.

It was probably after the foundation of Thurii in the territory of Sybaris, that the Lucanians appeared in the northern part of the country, the modern Basilicata. They first attacked Posidonia and captured it; they next conquered the western part of the whole country, which derived from them the name of Lucania, and then advanced more and more against the Greek towns, as on the eastern coast against Thurii and Croton, which now dropped their former jealousy in order to defend themselves against the common enemy. But they were so far reduced as to be confined within their own walls. This extension of the Lucanians becomes manifest about the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. Strabo is not correct in saying, that the Lucanians expelled the Oenotrians and Chonians, for they only subdued them. The decisive battle of Laos between the population of Magna Graecia and the Lucanians, in which the latter gained the upper hand, belongs to the period of the conquest of Rome by the Gauls; and this battle prostrated the Greeks for ever. Lucania now became a great state, extending from the frontier of the Hirpinians to the gates of Rhegium. But it did not long maintain itself in this extent. The Sabellian Lucanians were not numerous enough to rule over so large a territory. The consequence of their victory over the Greek towns was, that the latter were broken, and that the ancient serfs of the Greeks in those parts, a portion of the Lucanians themselves, and the subjects of the Lucanians, constituted themselves as an independent state under the name of the Bruttii. Henceforth Lucania was reduced to about one half of its former territory; but it retained this extent until the last period of the Roman empire, and under its name a separate region of Italy was formed.

Lucania was fearfully devasted during the several wars which were carried on there. The resistance of the Lucanians against the Romans was not so desperate as that of the Samnites, whence they did not suffer so much when at length they were obliged to succumb. But they com-

mitted the folly of throwing themselves into the arms of Hannibal; the consequence of which was that the Romans destroyed their towns one after another; some of them, however, which remained faithful to Rome, especially the capital, Petelia, were severely treated by Hannibal. After the war a great part of their territory became Roman domain land. Still, however, they recovered to some extent; they then took part in the Social War, but do not appear to have suffered much. The result was that they obtained the Roman franchise. But they again suffered severely during the servile war of Spartacus, whose real head-quarters were in Lucania and Bruttium; at that time the country was changed into a wilderness. From Cicero's speech for Tullius, we see that at Thurii every thing was burnt down. Lucania is a woody mountainous country, and the Apennines in those parts are full of the most beautiful forests; during the latter period of the republic large estates were formed there; the free population was for the most part extirpated, and the large farms were managed by slaves, coloni being seldom employed, and wherever slaves put their feet, not a blade of grass remained. Hence, during the first centuries of the empire, the country was almost deserted, and was employed only as pasture land; the population had become completely uncivilised. From the edicts of the emperors during the fourth and fifth centuries, we see what terrible people those slaves were: the severest laws were enacted merely to establish some security; they were disarmed, and for ever forbidden the use of any weapons whatsoever.

BRUTTIUM was in the same condition; it had been laid waste as early as the Hannibalian war. After the war of Pyrrhus, the Bruttians had obtained tolerable terms from the Romans, and their subsequent revolt was not provoked by any act on the part of the Romans. They suffered especially from the circumstance that Hannibal, during the latter years of his war established himself among them, recruited his armies there, and carried many of their young

men capable of bearing arms with him to Africa. He was obliged, against his own inclination, to make heavy demands upon the country. The Romans, on the other hand, afterwards took fearful vengeance on them; although the events had been brought about less by the desire of the Bruttians than by unavoidable circumstances. The Romans deprived them of their political existence, and treated them as a people among whom only *servi publici* for all manner of services were levied. By this means, the Bruttians were reduced to a state of helotism. This is one of the reasons why they are not mentioned at all during the Social War; another circumstance contributing to the same result was that the Romans did not regard them as Italicans, but as Greeks.

I have not much to say respecting the towns in the interior of the country. PETELIA, an ancient Pelasgian town, the origin of which was connected with Greek traditions, was the capital of Lucania. CRUMENTUM was the most important town in the interior; the form of its name is like those of others with which we have become acquainted: the Pelasgian *Κρυμόεις* or *Κρυμοῦς* changes its termination into *entum*, and signifies "the cold," or "frosty," from its situation on a high hill.

In time of war, the Lucanians had a common magistrate, called *βασιλεὺς* by the Greeks, and *imperator* by the Romans, and a common constitution; but we know nothing about the political forms of the Bruttians. The inscriptions on Lucanian coins are Oscan, written in Greek characters; but the people, also, spoke Greek perfectly, so that the fact of the Pseudo-Pythagorean books being called Lucanian is not against probability. The Lucanian coins are far less beautiful than those of Bruttium, which have Greek inscriptions, and are like the most beautiful coins of Greek cities. Though, therefore, they destroyed Greek towns, still they learned and cultivated the arts of the Greeks. CONSENTIA was the capital of the Bruttians, and the modern Cosenza is likewise a capital.

The great SILA forest, in the north of Bruttium, was of great importance to the Bruttians; it was very extensive, and such a large forest shows the desolation of the country from war. It furnished the Romans with excellent timber for ship-building, and also yielded a considerable revenue from the manufacture of tar.

GREEK TOWNS ON THE COAST OF ITALY.

CALLIPOLIS (now Gallipoli), a colony of Tarentum, situated on the Iapygian promontory on the south-east of Tarentum, has no historical interest. But TARENTUM itself is all the more important. This city is generally spoken of by the ancients, and especially by Livy, with great moral contempt. I am quite sure that no man is less disposed to put forth paradoxes than I: on the contrary, every paradox is repulsive to me, and calls forth in me a feeling of distrust. There are, however, many points in history on which we cannot help asserting the very opposite of the opinion generally current. People speak of the Tarentines as if they had been completely lost in luxuries and effeminacy, and as if they had really deserved the frightful fate they had to endure; they are spoken of with contempt, because, it is said, they embarked in great undertakings, but did not possess the strength to carry them out by themselves, and lived in a constant round of sensual pleasures. But it is especially the ὕβρις and βδελυρία which the Tarentines displayed towards the Roman ambassadors, that has made an indelible stain on their character. Now, although I am far from believing that the Tarentines were deserving of any unusual degree of moral respect, yet I must positively assert, that the things for which they are so generally condemned, are for the most part false, and in

some points the allegations against them are no grounds for condemnation. It is impossible to despise a people which, while the other Greek towns succumbed to the Italians, rose to such greatness during that very period, and without being favoured by any outward circumstances. Such a thing cannot be done without skill, ability, and character; it is not a mere fortunate accident, especially in a republic, where a brilliant period cannot be brought about by a single great ruler, as in a monarchy. Moreover, Tarentum produced an Archytas, who was, perhaps, the greatest philosopher, mathematician, and statesman, in all antiquity, unless we may except Thucydides who, if he had wished it, might have become equally great in the sciences; but he took no interest in them. Such a man usually cannot expect the most favourable reception among his countrymen, the voice of envy and jealousy immediately rising against him. But Archytas was, notwithstanding all this, repeatedly placed at the head of the state as its strategus, and with such confidence, that the democratic Tarentines allowed themselves to be guided and directed entirely by him. This circumstance alone would convince me, that they do not deserve the harsh sentence which posterity has pronounced upon them: however much they may have degenerated fifty years later, at that time their prosperity was not undeserved.

Ancient Tarentum was a very extensive place; the modern town with its 18,000 or 20,000 inhabitants, though, it is true, they live very close together, does not occupy more space than the ancient acra, the original Laconian colony, around which the new town arose and extended. This immense new town has disappeared, though its circumference can still be recognised. It is well known, that the origin of Tarentum is connected with the history of Laconia; the story has indeed some historical foundation, but is evidently perverted; and the statement about Phalanthus and the Parthenii has no historical character at all. In very many states, in which no connubium existed between the different parts of the population, the persons sprung

from unlawful marriages between members of the ruling and those of the subject people, endangered the government of the ruling class. Such were the Parthenii. For about two centuries and a half the Tarentines were powerful far and wide, but an attempt they made about the time of the Persian wars, to reduce the Messapians to the condition of helots, failed, and they suffered a defeat from which for a century they could not recover; the defeat, according to Herodotus, was the most bloody that had ever been sustained by a Greek nation. Still, however, Tarentum afterwards recovered, and that too at a period when we should least expect it, when Thurii, Croton, and other towns sank, and when in many parts the towns entirely disappeared. It may be, that Tarentum offered a place of refuge to the Greeks expelled from Caulon and other places; but the people must have made every effort to overcome their difficult circumstances, for their city became very powerful. It now assumed altogether a commercial and manufacturing character, and became the real emporium for southern Italy, and perhaps for Samnium also. Salt was a lucrative article of its commerce; it had excellent wool, cloth manufactories, and dyeing establishments; purple in particular was made there in the greatest perfection. Tarentum was in every respect an industrial place, with extensive navigation and fisheries. Such a population could not possibly feel inclined to serve in the army as a heavy-armed infantry, such as was then required; their cavalry was anything but contemptible; it was distinguished for peculiar tactics of its own. The fact that they enlisted foreign mercenaries, ought not to be made a subject of reproach to them, as they were a commercial people, and as it was the general practice of the Greeks at that time. That they took into their pay foreign princes with their whole armies, may have been imprudent; but in this respect too they did no more than what was done by England, which, during the eighteenth century, often took whole regiments of foreign countries into its service, a system which the United States of the Netherlands followed

ever since the time of Maurice of Orange. It was the natural consequence of circumstances; and it is absurd to expect of such a wealthy commercial people, that it should be as great in war as an agricultural people. They, no doubt, did not conceal from themselves the fact that their military system was bad; but politics cannot always control all circumstances. The Tarentines certainly do not deserve the reproach of ingratitude towards Alexander of Epirus, for his intention was to set himself up as king of southern Italy, and he first acted as an enemy towards them. The fate of Tarentum in its contest with Rome is known from history: after the fall of Samnium, it threw itself into the arms of Pyrrhus, after whose death it was betrayed and sold. According to the Roman historians, Rome treated the city very generously, leaving it independent: this independence, however, may have been a mere name; the Romans for a long time kept a garrison there, which, in the Hannibalian war defended the old town against the siege of Hannibal. The new town threw itself into the arms of the Carthaginian, but he could not maintain it, and the inhabitants were obliged to surrender to the Romans, who now took cruel vengeance and destroyed the place. In the time of C. Gracchus it became a Roman colony.

The Greek towns of Southern Italy are comprised under the general name of MAGNA GRAECIA; whether this name also included Tarentum, or whether it was limited to the coast of Oenotrian Italy, and whether it also embraced the interior, these are questions which, so far as I know, the ancients do not decide, though the name was in use at a very early period. If we possessed the work of Antiochus of Syracuse, a contemporary of Herodotus, it would perhaps furnish us information about it; from Ephorus and Eratosthenes we could hardly expect to learn anything on this point. It is possible also that the name ἡ μεγάλη Ἑλλάς may not have been confined to the Greek towns.

In enumerating these towns, we may follow a twofold system: we may either trace them along the coast,

beginning with the one next to Tarentum and thus proceeding as far as Posidonia, or we may arrange them according to the Greek tribes to which they belonged, and according to the alleged periods of their foundation. The first system may be traced on any map where they follow one another in this order: Metapontum, Heraclea, Siris (which is found in very few maps), Sybaris (afterwards Thurii), Croton, Scylletion, Caulon, Locri, and Rhegium: on the other side, we have Hipponium, Laos, Pyxus, Elea, and Posidonia. These towns were colonies of different tribes, but the most important among them were of Achaean origin. The original number of the latter was four, which again became the mother towns of the rest; even in regard to the fourth, however, it is not certain whether it was not a colony of Croton. Sybaris was the most ancient among them: next came Croton; Metapontum, the third, was of much more recent origin; and the fourth, was Caulon or Caulonia, concerning which, as I have already said, it is doubtful whether it was an Achaean colony, or whether it received at the same time settlers from Croton, as was the case at Apollonia which was founded by Corinth and Corcyra conjointly.

The colonies of the Locrians are equally ancient, and, according to tradition, they even belong to an earlier date. Both these sets of colonies again founded others: the Achaean Laos founded Scidros, Elea (a mixed colony), and Posidonia; and the Locrians built Hipponium and Medma. There were also Ionian colonies of different kinds; Siris was a very ancient Colophonian settlement; Rhegium, a Chalcidian colony of a more recent date, afterwards founded Pyxus. Elea, too, may be called Ionian, inasmuch as the fugitives from Phocaea were admitted there, as those from Colophon had been at Siris. They accordingly lie, as it were, in chronological strata above one another, not proceeding in their origin from the same points.

In regard to some of these colonies, the same question

presents itself which we had to answer in the case of those in Asia Minor, namely, whether they were really ancient Greek colonies in the sense in which they are so called by our historians, or whether they are not partially of earlier origin, so that, being originally founded by people akin to the Greeks, they afterwards assumed an entirely Greek character. This is really probable in the case of some of them, but nothing certain can be said about it. This opinion is most plausible in regard to the Locrians, for the accounts of their origin are too mythical, and they act a part in all the ancient traditions relating to the period of the Siculi and Itali. The only definite tradition about their origin is the one mentioned by Aristotle, of which I shall speak in due time. The fact, that the Achaeans appear as a colonising people, is likewise mysterious, as they are so insignificant in the early history of Greece. However, Zacynthos, too, is an Achaean colony, and one of the results of the historical inquiries of modern times is, that very little is known about Greek history previous to the Persian wars. Many changes, therefore, may have taken place, of which we are completely ignorant: as the Achaeans passed through a revolution in Aegialos, it is at all events possible, that previously they were a more important people, and that after the Doric migration the oppressed perioeci may have assembled and emigrated from Peloponnesus, just as the Minyans are said to have emigrated from Taenaron to other parts. But these things scarcely admit of sober criticism, and I will not dwell upon them. I shall now enumerate the towns according to the common practice beginning with the most important. The Achaean colonies will be mentioned first.

SYBARIS, according to tradition, was the most ancient among the Achaean towns. It has a great name, but in the period of historical certainty it had ceased to exist. The greatness of Sybaris is beyond a doubt, but all the details related about the luxuriousness of its inhabitants, their wealth, their works of art, and their final catastrophe,

are either doubtful or altogether fabulous. The numbers of its inhabitants and of the men capable of bearing arms are exaggerated in an almost oriental fashion, for at its destruction, the city is said to have had 300,000 men capable of bearing arms; the manner also, in which Croton is said to have gained the battle, is a mere silly story. But we need not wonder at the fabulous character of these accounts, or at the obscurity of the history, for all the early history of Greece is in the same predicament, and Roman history too begins very late. We must be on our guard not to measure the history of the western nations by the standard of eastern annals. Even if we trace the contemporary records among the Hebrews only as far as the time of Solomon, we already reach a very early period compared with that to which history ascends in Greece. There can be no doubt, that the Egyptians had annals from the period of the seventeenth dynasty, that is, from the time of Sesostris and Amenophis, or the expulsion of the Hycsos; but the Greeks had no such ancient contemporary records, and although there existed certain annalistic tables, as for example, the list of the priestesses at Argos, still they did not, like the oriental annals, constitute a history, but were mere lists of years. It is of extreme importance to an historical philologer, to know how late Greek history commences. At the period of my youth, I and those of the same age with me grew up under the most erroneous notions in this respect. I was already a young man, when it first occurred to me to doubt the truth of the stories about the Messenian wars and about Aristomenes; in the common histories of Greece no doubts were expressed, the events were assigned to definite years, and were narrated as confidently as if they were reported on the best historical authority. People are not yet sufficiently free from these thoroughly erroneous notions, although a right view has already gained some ground. All we know about Sybaris with certainty is, that it was destroyed several years before the period which we regard as the time of the expulsion of the Roman kings; Greek

writers place the destruction three years before this event; but synchronistic statements of this kind are of no value. Posidonia and Laos on the opposite coast were colonies of Sybaris, whence we may suppose that all Lucania, with the exception of Metapontum, was subject to it. Sybaris and all those towns became great and powerful within an incredibly short period, which probably arose from the fact of their being commercial colonies. The rapidity, with which commercial cities rise, is exemplified by New York, which 120 years ago had no more than 1000 inhabitants, while at present its population amounts to upwards of 140,000. The same increase has taken place at Philadelphia. If, as is generally supposed, Sybaris at the time of its destruction had existed for two centuries, we may easily admit that it had become great and powerful, and hence there is nothing impossible in the statement, that it ruled over four nations and twenty-five towns. We must also bear in mind, that those Greek towns might grow up even with much greater rapidity than the English colonies in North America; for in the latter all the settlers were Europeans, and consequently quite foreign to the original population; in southern Italy, on the other hand, the greater part of the population consisted unquestionably of native Oenotrians, who were by no means foreign to the Greeks. In countries where the natives were foreign to them, as on the Euxine, their colonies never rose so rapidly as on the coasts of Asia Minor and Italy, where they settled among kindred tribes. Cyrene, which was a large city, perhaps forms the only exception in this respect.

In regard to the history of Sybaris, it is certain that Sybaris and Tarentum, being Achaean and Dorian towns respectively, were hostile to each other, and that there was a time when Sybaris and Croton, both of Achaean origin, were on friendly terms. The object of the dispute with Tarentum was the fertile district between the Acalandrus and the Siris, which was called Siritis; and in order to maintain their possession of it, the Sybarites are said to have invited

other Achaeans to come over, and these latter are reported to have founded—

METAPONTUM.[1] Its name shows the same formation which we have already observed on several other occasions, and leads us to a form *Μεταποῦς*, analogous to *Μαλοῦς*. This town, which was founded under the protection of Sybaris, may in reality not have been in a state of independence as long as Sybaris was a powerful state; in order to preserve the possession of its territory, Metapontum required the protection of the Sybarites against the neighbouring Oenotrians and Apulians; but after the fall of Sybaris, Metapontum may be regarded as an independent town. In the traditions we have of this place, as in those of several others, statements about its earlier Oenotrian condition are mixed up with those about its later Hellenic character; the Pelasgian traditions about it always refer to the Trojan legend, and hence Metapontum is mentioned as a Pylian colony. During the period down to the time when the Lucanians became powerful, the place, from the extraordinary fertility of its territory, became so wealthy as to equal the richest Greek towns in Italy. The Metapontines are said to have sent a *θέρος χρυσοῦν* to Delphi, which was probably a golden sheaf, the produce of the tithes. Their great wealth is also attested by the very numerous gold and silver coins of Metapontum, of very beautiful workmanship, and mostly of great antiquity. Afterwards, however, all the towns in those parts were overpowered by the Lucanians, and Metapontum, also, which was deprived of its territory, must have lost its greatness in consequence. Afterwards, it suffered severely from the Greek and Epirot armies, which were called into the country by the Tarentines. Alexander of Epirus and Cleonymus of Sparta for a time occupied Metapontum with garrisons, and Cleonymus in particular acted with disgraceful cruelty: he took hostages, and plundered and pillaged

[1] "Do not allow yourselves to be misguided by my occasionally departing from the regular division, for I follow the historical connection subsisting between the towns."

the town. After that time it never recovered. In the war of Pyrrhus, Metapontum was an insignificant place; in the second Punic war, it attached itself to Hannibal, and afterwards it is, as if a wave had passed over it and washed it away, though we do not know how or when; but we hear no more of it. In the age of Strabo, it was a small place, but in point of fact, it had perished.

The destruction of Sybaris by the Crotoniats was the death-blow to the Greek towns in those parts, for the Crotoniats were not able to protect the country against the invading Lucanians and Oenotrians. Some of the surviving Sybarites withdrew to their colonies of Laos and Scidros, and others built a small place of the name of Sybaris in a distant part; all attempts to rebuild the ancient city failed, for Croton and the vengeance of the emancipated serfs prevented it. In this distress they applied to the Athenians, who in the days of their greatness appear everywhere as the defenders of the Hellenic name: on this occasion, too, they were ready to assist the unfortunate Sybarites, and invited colonists from all parts of Greece to settle at Sybaris. The reason why Croton did not oppose this new settlement may have been the fact, that the people of the interior were advancing more and more; the Crotoniats probably felt, that a powerful Greek colony in the neighbourhood might be very useful to them: Posidonia, too, was probably already lost. At a deliberation of the Spartans and their allies, a Greek said, that if Athens were destroyed, "the spring would be taken out of Hellas,"[1]—the destruction of Sybaris had taken the spring out of Magna Graecia. The settlement at THURII succeeded without any opposition on the part of the Italicans. It was called an Athenian colony; but the Athenians formed only a small portion of the population, which con-

[1] There is probably some mistake here; for what was said on that occasion is, that Greece ought not to be deprived of one of its eyes. It was Gelon, who, using a similar metaphor, spoke of "the spring being taken out of Greece," when he was invited to take part in the war against the Persians (Herod. vii. 162).—ED.

sisted of Dorians and Ionians, islanders as well as emigrants from the mainland, who had been invited by the Athenians, without any distinction, as to a general Greek enterprise; the Athenians did not reserve for themselves any petty advantages, being satisfied with the consciousness that history would call them the restorers of Sybaris. Thurii must have been a strong colony, whence it soon rose to importance. The ancient name was probably ominous, as Sybaris had been destroyed twice, or perhaps even three times. The name Thurii is said to have been derived from a well. This is possible; but the emblem of Sybaris on ancient coins (for there are some very ancient ones) is always a bull, whence it is quite possible, that this emblem may have been the cause of the name, for θούριος signifies *ferox*, fierce, wild. Thurii soon became involved in constant wars with the Lucanians; but fifty or sixty years after its foundation it was already so powerful that it could lose more than 10,000 men in battle against the Lucanians. This loss, however, was a blow from which it never could thoroughly recover; it was soon after confined to its own territory, and perhaps even obliged to pay tribute to protect itself against the devastations of the Lucanians. In the wars of the Tarentines and the other Greeks against the Lucanians, Thurii is indeed still mentioned, but it sank more and more, until in the end it was taken and plundered by the Lucanians. Afterwards, it placed itself under the protection of the Romans, who, however, were unable to prevent its being plundered a second time by the Tarentines. Subsequently it sank so low, that after the Hannibalian war a Latin colony was established there; but this colony was equally unfortunate, for during the war of Spartacus it was razed to the ground, as we see from the fragments of Cicero's speech for Tullius, recently discovered by A. Mai.

The next place is CROTON, which, according to tradition, was founded shortly after Sybaris. There exist very contradictory accounts about this town, and it is difficult to

discover any connection among them. Heyne has written several essays on all the towns of Magna Graecia; he ought not to be undervalued, but nearly all his works were written in too great a hurry; he had overburdened himself with official business and his own undertakings, and it is melancholy to see how a man of such truly beautiful talents does not rise above mediocrity in his writings. On the whole, he has only produced imperfect works; if he had concentrated himself more, if he had been willing to do less, and if he had not been possessed by an unfortunate πολυπραγμοσύνη, he would certainly have acquired a great and lasting reputation. The best intentions in such a case are of no avail; posterity will not heed them; for it does not ask, What is the number of a man's works? but, What are they? His fate may be described in the words of Scripture: "He is gone hence, and not a trace of him is left behind." Heyne also founded a school which was bad, though his followers were celebrated in Germany, as if they were great scholars. From it, however, men proceeded, who, though outwardly belonging to it, kept themselves independent of the school, as F. A. Wolf and others, who are the real restorers of the sound philology which is now flourishing. Heyne's essays are pleasant to read; but he who is familiar with their subjects, sees before him a man who does not take the trouble to examine things, who is satisfied with vague conceptions, and shows the greatest indifference as to what is possible and what is not; it is only now and then that a bright idea reminds us of his original talent. But, notwithstanding all this, Heyne's essays ought not to be left unread. Very different is the case of Bentley, and I must strongly recommend to you every thing he has written on similar subjects.

There is great difficulty in the tradition about Croton, according to which it was so powerful that it became insolent, and attempted to subdue the Locrians; the Locrians, however, it is said, owing to the favour of the gods, who took pity on the oppressed, gained quite an unexpected and

glorious victory over them. Hereupon, tradition says, the Crotoniats renounced war and lived in effeminacy, until Pythagoras appeared among them, and by a new religion which he taught, and by new ordinances, introduced a fresh spirit and improved manners among them. Yet here again the mystery is, how, during that very period of moral debasement, the Crotoniats could stand in the same relation to Sybaris, as that in which Locri stood to Croton. One might be inclined to place the battle on the Sagra, according to Justin and other indications, between Olympiad 70 and 80; and I myself formerly entertained this opinion; but after the discovery of the "Excerpta de Sententiis" from Diodorus and Polybius, it cannot be doubted that the ancients placed it in Olymp. 50. From this, then, it follows, that the stories of their insolence, effeminacy, and moral debasement, must be regarded as mere arbitrary inventions. Although no such exaggerated numbers are mentioned in the case of Croton as in that of Sybaris, yet 100,000 armed men are said to have been arrayed against the Locrians on the Sagra, and the circumference of the city is said to have been twelve Roman miles; Livy, who no doubt took the account from Polybius, states it to have been 100 stadia, and this does not appear fabulous. The greatness of Croton belongs to an early period, but afterwards its power must have sunk in consequence of circumstances which are unknown to us. Traces of internal commotions occur in the well-known account of the persecution of the Pythagoreans. This sect went hand in hand with the aristocracy; its downfall was connected with the development of democracy, and was not so much the consequence of its religious as of its political character. This accounts for the fact, that Croton had already ceased to be a powerful state, when, according to Diodorus, Magna Graecia becomes prominent in history, that is, about the time of the foundation of Thurii. When the Lucanians were spreading far and wide, and Thurii received its fatal blow at Laos, the Crotoniats are not mentioned with any degree of distinction, but are

treated like the inhabitants of the other cantons of that country. But if it had been a town of small extent, Dionysius the elder would not have been so anxious to gain possession of it; he besieged and conquered it in a nocturnal surprise, by attacking it on a side where it was believed to be almost inaccessible. This capture of Croton, which Diodorus strangely says nothing about, must have been very destructive in its effects upon the place. Dionysius, it is true, afterwards quitted it, and it recovered its independence, but thenceforth its fate was always very deplorable. Croton was obliged to submit to Alexander of Epirus, though he inflicted no injury upon it; but Agathocles, in his undertaking against Corcyra, besieged it in passing; the town was then governed by the tyrant Menecrates, whom Agathocles deceived by pretending that he was anxious to form connections with him; but he then suddenly changed the course of his fleet which was bound for Corcyra, and having landed at Croton, captured the town. Not quite twenty-five years later, in A. U. 450, the Romans under P. Cornelius Rufinus took it by assault; and this catastrophe, as we see from Livy's account of the Hannibalian war, completely broke its power. It now shrunk together within its ancient circumference in the same manner as e. g., Pisa, or Leyden, which once had 100,000 inhabitants, while at present it has only 20,000. When a person walks on the ramparts of Pisa, he sees the modern town concentrated in the centre of its ancient circumference. Pisa is at present as desolate as many an eastern city, such as, e. g., Basra or Ispahan; such also was the condition of Rome in the middle ages, especially during the time when the popes resided at Avignon. The arx of Croton was situated in the centre of the town, and around it a few houses were still standing: all the rest had become changed into fields. In the Hannibalian war, the Bruttians took the town and demanded of the inhabitants to share it with them, but the Crotoniats preferred emigrating to living together with them. The Bruttians then established a colony there, but after the

conclusion of the war they were expelled by the Romans, who now sent a colony thither; but this was not very successful either. At present Croton is a little country-town.

It is remarkable that, considering the importance of the cities of Magna Graecia, so few monuments of antiquity are found in all of them: there are cameos and coins of Tarentum, but few statues.

In the neighbourhood of Croton there was a temple of *Juno Lacinia* on the Lacinian promontory. This promontory on the one side, and the Iapygian on the other, inclose the gulf of Tarentum. Lacinia is generally taken as a proper name of Juno, and from it the name of the promontory is derived; but this is incorrect: the adjective is an ethnic name, and *Juno Lacinia* and *Acra Lacinia* are nothing else but Juno and the Acra of the Lacinii, that is, the Latini, in the sense in which all the Pelasgian Italiots are so called. According to the most authentic accounts, this temple of Juno Lacinia is more ancient than the Greek settlements on those coasts; in the remotest times it was the common sanctuary of the Oenotrians, and afterwards it passed into the hands of the Crotoniats. During the period of Croton's greatness it was extremely rich, and traces of its wealth existed as late as the Hannibalian war; but in the course of this war it was profaned and plundered by the Romans. Hannibal had his head-quarters there for a long time, and caused a large tablet, containing a history of his own exploits in the Greek and Punic languages, to be set up in the temple. How valuable would such a document be, if it were preserved! I shall pass over the small places south of the Lacinian promontory, and proceed to—

CAULON or CAULONIA, a small Achaean town, which had a common diet with the other places.

LOCRI, was probably not a real Greek colony, but a Hellenized place. If Locri was a Greek colony, this fact, too, would show, what is everywhere probable from their very situation, that the Ozolian Locrians and those *πέραν Εὐβοίας* once

belonged to each other, and that they were torn asunder only by the immigration of the Dolopians; and that accordingly they were a much larger people. We must, therefore, be on our guard not to blame Virgil, as he has been blamed for calling the Locrians *Narycii*. People say, it is inconceivable that the Locrians should have been called *Narycii*, as mount Naryx was situated opposite Euboea, while the Italian Locrians were descended from the Ozolian Locrians (according to Strabo). Virgil did not conceive the Locrians as divided, but as one unbroken race, extending from the Corinthian to the Euboean sea. The Locrians in Italy are called *Ἐπιζεφύριοι*, that is, *ἐπὶ Ζεφυριῷ*, on the promontory of Zephyrium. Hitherto the traditions about these Locrians have been a curious puzzle. The ancient excerpts from the twelfth book of Polybius contain traces of a great controversy of Timaeus, who is raving against Aristotle on account of what he had said about the origin of the Locrians. But what Aristotle actually had said, is not mentioned by the epitomizer, and it could only be guessed that he had derived their origin from slaves. Besides this, there was a passage of Dionysius Periegeta, in which he says of the Locrians *σφετέρῃς μιχθέντες ἀνάσσαις*, on which the passage of the scholiast is incomplete. But from the new "Excerpta de Sententiis," the whole matter has become clear. Aristotle relates the following tradition. In the first Messenian war, the Locrians furnished the Spartans with auxiliaries, and all their men capable of bearing arms had taken the field. During their absence, their wives and daughters led a licentious life with their servants; and from fear of their returning masters, the servants with their concubines emigrated. Timaeus in saying that this story sounds fabulous, made easy game of Aristotle, if he supposed that Aristotle believed it to be true; but I would undertake to answer for it that Aristotle did not give the story as a real historical tradition, but that he mentioned it only as a legend of the Locrians. He no doubt asserted that the Italian Locrians were not a colony of the Greek

Locrians, and that, if they were Locrians, they were so only through the women. Timaeus might easily have investigated the matter; but his object was only to find fault with Aristotle. But such disgraceful conduct always receives its punishment in due time, and Polybius has prepared it for him. If here, as everywhere else, we put aside the mythical story, we find that the foundation of the Locrian state in Italy belongs to the period of the decay of the constitution of the *gentes*, when in various places illegitimate marriages between the ancient families and the δῆμος gave rise to a mixed race, which became dangerous to the aristocracy, and was, therefore, obliged to emigrate. The same fact forms the basis of the story about Phalanthus and the Parthenii.

But whatever may have been the origin of the Locrians, they bore in ancient times a very respectable character, for they defeated the Crotoniats in the battle on the Sagra. The Greek proverb ἀληθέστερα τῶν ἐπὶ Σάγρᾳ must probably not be taken quite literally, at least, not in our narrative, in which it is said that the Dioscuri decided the issue of the contest. In like manner, St. James is said to have appeared on a white charger in the army of Ferdinand Cortez: a distinguished officer, who had been present at every point of the battle and seen nothing, got himself out of the difficulty by saying, that he had not been worthy to behold the saint. Such, also, may have been the case with the Dioscuri in the battle on the Sagra. At all events, however, the Locrians, through that battle, secured their independence, and for a period of 150 years thereafter, they lived in happy prosperity, which was disturbed by Dionysius, who endeavoured to gain influence in the Greek towns of Italy by marrying a citizen of one of them. A Rhegine maiden being refused to him, he took a Locrian for his wife. For this reason Locri was greatly favoured; but after Dionysius' death, his son, on being obliged to withdraw from Sicily, betook himself to Locri, where he raged like a Nero or an Elagabalus. When, afterwards, he was forced to return to Sicily, the Locrians took vengeance on his

family, and then had to sustain a siege, during which, there being no hope of pardon, they offered a most vigorous resistance, and risked their all upon it. Their territory fell into the hands of the Bruttians, but in the war of Pyrrhus, Locri was still a considerable state. On that occasion, however, they acted an unworthy part: they first requested the Romans to send them a garrison against the Bruttians, and then betrayed it into the hands of Pyrrhus. After this, Pyrrhus placed a garrison of Italicans and Bruttians there, who again betrayed the town to the Romans. Sixty years later, the Locrians delivered up a Roman garrison into the hands of Hannibal: they then repented of their treachery—a fickleness which often occurs among the Greeks—and again opened their gates to the Romans. But this last act was not set down to their credit, for Q. Pleminius, who was left behind there by Scipio with a garrison, conducted himself like the commanders of the troops of the League during the thirty years' war, like Colonel Hatzfeld at Rostock, and as the imperial commanders in general, with their Croats, conducted themselves in Germany. Pleminius treated the town as if it had been taken by the sword; at length, however, the Locrians succeeded in inducing the Roman senate to interfere, and to punish the offender; the account of his conduct gives us some idea of the manner in which war was carried on in those times. The town continued to exist after these events, but was quite insignificant; its greatest importance consisted in a temple of Proserpine with a rich treasury. Pyrrhus had plundered the sanctuary, but being warned by visions in a dream, he restored the treasures; Q. Pleminius afterwards plundered it more effectually.

The next town, RHEGIUM, was a Chalcidian colony, of a much more recent date than the others, being founded about Olymp. 50. During the period when it was the residence of Anaxilaus, it was a powerful city. At the time of the Sicilian expedition, Rhegium, like all the other Chalcidian towns, was allied with Athens. The Rhegines refused

to give one of their daughters in marriage to Dionysius, and were injudicious enough to insult him, by saying that they had no other girl suited to him except the daughter of the hangman, which was the most offensive thing they could have done. At the time when Corsica was still independent, no Corsican ever took the office of hangman, but from hatred of Genoa, the Corsicans always appointed a Genoese. Dionysius laid siege to the town, and the Rhegines defended themselves with the courage of lions, but were overpowered; and their fate was terrible. But the situation of the town is so fortunate, that a town will always exist there in spite of earthquakes and other ravages. A hundred years later, Rhegium was, if possible, still more unfortunate. In the war of Pyrrhus, a Campanian legion, at the request of the Rhegines themselves, was sent there by the Romans, for the purpose of cutting off the communication between Pyrrhus and the Mamertines in Sicily. But this garrison, under the command of Decius Jubellius, massacred the male inhabitants, and took possession of their wives and children. At the conclusion of the war, the Romans took the town by force, and the 300 survivors of the 4,000 who had composed the Campanian legion, were beheaded in the Forum at Rome. The surviving Rhegines were then called together, and their territory was restored to them. Henceforth, Rhegium remained a prosperous little commercial town, and experienced no further misfortunes.

HIPPONIUM, a colony of Locri, was taken and destroyed by the Bruttians, and then rebuilt by the Carthaginians, which is the only instance of a Carthaginian town in Italy. During the latter period of Agathocles, and shortly before the war with Pyrrhus, the Bruttians seem again to have been masters of the place. Afterwards the Romans established a colony there, under the name of *Vibo Valentia.*

Proceeding along the coast in a northern direction, we come to LAOS, on the line which subsequently formed the frontier between Lucania and Bruttium. It was a colony of Sybaris, and is celebrated on account of the defeat sustained

by the united towns of Magna Graecia, especially Thurii, against the Lucanians, who wanted to relieve the town from a siege. At that time, the Lucanians had already extended themselves along the coast, and Posidonia was their first conquest.

PYXUS or BUXENTUM, between Laos and Posidonia, was founded by the Rhegines at the time of Anaxilaus and Micythus, who were contemporaries of Darius Hystaspis. There can be no doubt that it was afterwards taken by the Lucanians, but it was snatched from them by the Romans, who surrendered it to the Campanians at the settlement they made with them, whence Buxentum is afterwards mentioned among the Campanian towns. After the Hannibalian war, the Romans established a colony there.

ELEA or VELIA, a town which preserved its Greek character in a wonderful manner, was situated not far from Buxentum. It was a colony of the Phocaeans, established in the reign of Cyrus, after they had in vain endeavoured to form a settlement in Corsica (Olymp. 60). In the history of literature, Elea is remarkable for the great and profound philosophers who formed the Eleatic school. As Amalfi, though surrounded by Lombard armies, preserved its pure Italian and Roman character, so Elea remained a Greek place down to the latest times. The father of the poet Statius was a Greek of Elea, and Statius' *Graia Selle* is nothing else than Elea, as Markland has shown; some persons have strangely referred it to Epirus, and some perhaps do so still. Elea was allied with Rome, and was honoured and distinguished by her. It perished at a time which can no longer be defined, in consequence of the ravages of barbarians.

POSIDONIA or PAESTUM was the most powerful among the Greek cities on that coast. The place still has the most beautiful Greek ruins in all Italy, and three ancient temples are preserved there in tolerable completeness; before the first half of the eighteenth century, they were not known at all, for they were not discovered till 1730. The cause

of this may have been the circumstance, that they are situated in a very pestilential and deserted district; but at present they are known to everybody. The ruins belong to the ancient Greek period, when Posidonia was still powerful. There have also been found great numbers of coins of a very ancient style, resembling those of Sybaris, which are at least as old as the sixtieth Olympiad, and perhaps even older. Posidonia was conquered by the Lucanians, though it is unknown at what time, and it remained under their dominion until the war of Pyrrhus, when the Romans established a colony there under the name of Paestum. The fact, that previously the Lucanians had a colony there, is clear from the account of Aristoxenus, in Athenaeus, about an annual festival which the inhabitants celebrated quite in the ancient Greek fashion, and at which they, among other things, complained of their losing their Greek character and peculiarities, and of their becoming barbarians in consequence of their being ruled over by barbarians. Athenaeus indeed mentions the Romans as their rulers, but he is either mistaken in the name, or the book which he quotes was not by Aristoxenus, but a *pseudepigraphon*, which is certainly possible. It is interesting on this occasion to become acquainted with the nature of the colonies, and with the manner in which a new ruling class of men establish themselves among the people, introducing their language and manners to such an extent as to cause the nationality of the ancient inhabitants to disappear. The most striking example of this phenomenon is the diffusion of the language and manners of the Arabs over the East and Africa: all the languages which were previously spoken there, Greek, Latin, Egyptian, and Syriac, having given way to the Arabic. In like manner, the Turkish language has become predominant in Armenia and Hyrcania. This accounts for the fact, that, although the Arab immigration into Spain was not very numerous in comparison with the ancient inhabitants, yet when in the thirteenth century Andalusia was re-conquered by the Christians, the people

spoke nothing but Arabic. The Ommayad khalifs had introduced the Arabic language by putting to death any one refusing to adopt it. The term colony, therefore, is very vague: we generally imagine that the colonists constitute the real body of the people; but this is not so, for the colony only furnishes the form. I very well remember, that about thirty-five years ago, when I read that account of Aristoxenus, the matter appeared to me strange; but the mixture of the two nationalities clears up everything.

ETRURIA.

Etruria is in every respect a highly important and interesting country, and in ancient history it is at the same time great and powerful; it derives a particular interest from the fact of its being the mother country of the modern Tuscans, a people on whom all the honour of Italy, in regard to intellectual and artistic greatness, rested during the middle ages no less than in modern times, just as the honour of Greece rested on Athens. In the whole range of modern history there is not a people, which is so strongly marked with the antique character as the Florentines; they possess all the great qualities of the Athenians, without their light-headedness. They also have been too severely judged of; I do not, indeed, mean to say that they are faultless, but they are, in spite of any faults, deserving of the highest respect. A man who is familiar with the old Italian literature and history, cannot but feel the greatest affection and attachment to Tuscany, and this affection and attachment are unconsciously transferred to the ancestors of the modern Tuscans. But the great renown enjoyed by the ancient Etruscans is not owing to this, but rather to the irresistible charm with which man is drawn towards that which is

mysterious and enigmatical. We can, indeed, see that the Etruscans were a very remarkable people, and that in regard to the fine arts, they occupy, next to the Greeks, the highest rank in antiquity; yet so many monuments and inscriptions of this same people are perfect mysteries to us; inscriptions exist in great numbers, but are altogether inexplicable. All the statements of the ancients about the Etruscans are full of contradiction. The difficulties have been increased by the opinion which has been established for a long time, that the Romans derived the greater part of their institutions and character from the Etruscans, an opinion which formerly I also entertained. But I have given it up, and in the second edition of my Roman History I have honestly stated my reasons. The cause of the great confusion among the ancients about them is the supposition that the Etruscans and Tyrrhenians were the same people. I have shown in my history that the Greeks, who are here our only authorities, as we have no other statements, called the Tyrrhenians Pelasgians, and Tyrrhenians existed not only on the coasts of Etruria, but occupied the whole coast of Italy down to the Oenotrian frontier, before the Ausonians subdued those districts. Being Pelasgians, the Tyrrhenians, according to the views of the Greeks, were of the same race as the ancient Meonians in Lydia, as the inhabitants of Lemnos and the islands near the Hellespont, and as the occupants of the neighbouring coasts. Hence also the tradition about the connection between the two. These original inhabitants of Etruria, from Luna as far as the Tiber, were then overpowered by a nation invading Italy from northern Europe, just as we have seen in the case of the Illyrians; Greek historians afterwards called the conquerors Tyrrhenians, partly because a large proportion of the population of Etruria actually was Tyrrhenian, and partly because the whole country bore the name Tyrrhenia. In like manner the English are called Britons, and the Spaniards in Mexico and Peru Mexicans and Peruvians; and in the same way the Greeks

applied the name Oscans to the Sabellians inhabiting Lucania and Samnium, although the Oscans were the subjects and the Sabellians the ruling people. As the conquerors have often entirely changed the language of the conquered people (the coins of Posidonia, when in the end it had become Roman, have Latin inscriptions in Latin characters), so the language of the Tyrrhenians, under the dominion of the Etruscans, gave way to the language of the rulers; and hence we cannot be surprised at finding on Etruscan monuments none but the mysterious Etruscan language. I mentioned before the Mexicans as an illustration: the Spaniards who conquered Mexico amounted only to a few thousands, while the country they subdued contained many millions of inhabitants. The latter, it is true, were extirpated by inhuman cruelty, epidemics, and the like; but still the fact of the Spanish language having become quite universal there remains a remarkable phenomenon. The Spanish colonists had scarcely any women with them, and accordingly took native Mexican women for their wives, whence we might expect to find the Spanish language would have disappeared all the more naturally and easily. It is a foolish opinion to believe that the depopulation of Spain was the consequence of the emigration to the provinces in America; for the number of emigrants to the new world was on the whole but small. Granting that in the course of time a few hundred thousand emigrated, the men who arrived there entirely without families, exercised such an influence upon the language of millions, that at present not a man in the city of Mexico speaks Mexican, and the native language exists only in the remotest districts; the commonest Indian speaks Spanish. There are even large provinces in New Spain where the ancient language has entirely disappeared, without its being possible to show that any considerable immigrations ever took place. In the Baltic provinces of Mecklenburg and Pomerania, where the ruling families have always remained the same, where the nobility consists for the most part of Wendish families, and

where the Germans have never appeared as conquerors, the Wendish language is entirely lost, merely because the introduction of Christianity from Germany was in the course of a few centuries followed by the German language. The ancient Tyrrhenian language may, even before the conquest, have become unsettled and shifting, as the Umbrians occupied the interior of the country while the Tyrrhenians inhabited the coasts.

The inquiries into the Etruscan language have hitherto yielded no results at all; all the alleged explanations by Mazzochi, Passeri, and Lanzi are mere delusions. I must direct your particular attention to the incredibly small compass of what is commonly called learning. Common sense has often been most disgracefully trampled under foot, and intuitive truth has been overlooked and disregarded; and this has been the case more particularly in the inquiries about the ancient Italian languages. People have been extremely anxious to discover the Etruscan language, and who should not be so? I would readily give a considerable part of my property as a prize to any one who should discover it; an entirely new light would thereby be thrown upon the character of the nations of Italy. But desirable as this object is, it does not follow that it is attainable; it is deplorable, however, if people assume it to be attainable without examining as to whether the method they adopt be the correct one. Passeri and Lanzi enjoy quite an undeserved reputation; they have treated the ancient Italian languages of the Etruscans and Umbrians in quite a disgraceful manner; and I have many years ago expressed my indignation at the absurdity with which the inquiry is pursued. Lanzi assumes that Etruscans and Tyrrhenians are the same,—a fact which has never been doubted—that Tyrrhenians are Pelasgians, and that Pelasgians are ancient Greeks: he then proceeds, without having any general principle to guide him, to interpret words merely according to some remote resemblance in sound to Greek or Latin words, and by this process he elicits a sense which is no better than if it had

been his object to make the whole inquiry ridiculous. Any one who has a taste for Greek must reject such trash with the greatest indignation. There are only a very few words the meaning of which can be guessed: on all the tombstones we read *avil ril* followed by a number (the Etruscan and Roman numbers are the same), whence we may suppose these two words to mean *vixit annos;* sometimes we find *ril* alone, which may accordingly mean "year." It is possible that the word is indeclinable, and it may even be imagined that all nouns in Etruscan, as in many eastern languages, are indeclinable. Now Lanzi, not being able to find a similar word in Greek or Latin, objects to the interpretation of these words which alone are known; and he connects *avil*, which probably signifies *vixit*, with the Greek *αἰών*, though he would prefer a word with a stronger resemblance. On several works of art we find the word *turce* added to a name, which he interprets *ἐποίει*, and I will let this pass; but he adds that *turce* is nothing but the contracted *τὸ ἔρξε*, that is, *τοὔρξε*. Such things have found admirers, and even in Germany! I feel no inclination to speculate where I do not stand on firm ground; but it certainly is much more probable, that *ce* is the termination of the noun, like *us* in Latin; and accordingly I say "*turce* may be the same as *Tuscus*, for *r* and *s* are very often interchanged." In the fifteenth century, a number of bronze tables were found at Gubbio in Umbria, with inscriptions partly in Etruscan and partly in Latin characters, but in an unknown language: who knows what these tables contain! A man with the faculty of divination possessed by Champollion might perhaps be able to explain the language, but it requires a full consciousness of the analogy of languages; this is the only way in which it might be made out, but it is impossible to explain it by itself. The Italians, like Passeri, have proceeded on the supposition that the Etruscans were *haruspices*, interpreters of lightning, and the like, and that consequently their monuments contain all kinds of *fulgwratio:* on such premises they then attempted to translate the inscriptions with

a truly revolting impertinence: you can scarcely form an idea of this kind of nonsense. I say this because I have been described as wanting in modesty by people who no doubt may have been extremely modest all their lives; and the remark has been added, that I had not read the productions of those inquirers. But I have read Lanzi's work, and deliberately declare that it is thoroughly bad. Lanzi was a man of talent and acuteness, but completely ignorant of Greek literature, and he had but a poor knowledge of Latin. He was an encyclopaedist, who undertook much, but finished only half of what he undertook. I have here expressed my conviction with the fullest confidence, that it is not only my conviction, but the pure truth. It is possible that a resemblance may be discovered between the Etruscan and the Ligurian language.

The ancients were far less concerned about the Etruscans than the moderns; they took indeed an interest in them, but did not enter deeply into the inquiry about them; and it may be that they were prevented by their utter ignorance of the Etruscan language. Herodotus relates that the Etruscans were a Lydian colony, a statement which has been correctly refuted even by Dionysius, who says that Xanthus the Lydian did not say anything about it; that the Lydians did not bear the slightest resemblance to the Etruscans in language, customs, manners, or religion; and that there existed no traditions about such a colony either among the Lydians or among the Etruscans. Herodotus had heard, that Tyrrhenians existed in Italy as well as in Lydia (where, however, the Meonians, and not the entirely foreign Lydians, were Tyrrhenians); his idea of a colony was a mere inference from his knowledge that the Tyrrhenians and Meonians were nations of the same race. But Tyrrheni and Tusci are the same words, and so are Tyrrheni, Turini, Turni; Tusculum is nothing but the town of the Tyrrheni; Etrusci and Tusci, however, are different, and the name Tusci was afterwards transferred to the Etrusci. The native name of the Etruscans was Rasena. Previously to the Gallic conquest, the same Etruscan nation was also established in the plains

of Lombardy; and, according to Livy, all the tribes about the river Padus, such as the Raeti and others belonged to it. It is, moreover, quite in accordance with all analogy to suppose that the nation had come down from the Alps in consequence of commotions in the north. Here we must also bear in mind the other tradition which states that, before the time of the Etruscans, the Umbrians dwelt in Etruria, and that 300 Umbrian towns were destroyed by the invading Etruscans. No importance can be attached to the number 300, which is only a multiple of 3; 3, 30, 300, and 600, all signify only "very many," and in other circumstances the same might be expressed by 4, 16, 64, etc. I am persuaded that the time is not far distant (it may have arrived already), when no man will think of quoting the statement of Herodotus about the Lydian origin of the Tyrrhenians as an authority against other opinions. Everything which, after the lapse of hundreds or thousands of years, has to be made out by reason and argument meets with opposition, and this is in accordance with nature; nay, it is good that it is so, as it imposes upon us the duty to give to our doctrines the greatest possible distinctness, and to expound them so clearly as to make them intelligible to all.

It is well-known that Etruria, south of the Apennines, contained twelve ruling towns, to which the others were subject. We must not, however, suppose that there existed no more than twelve places deserving the name of towns, but they were twelve sovereign cities, and all the others were dependent upon them. This fact is certain and beyond all doubt. They were all situated within the district from the Apennines about Luna and the Tiber. But which of the Etruscan towns they were, is quite a different question; some of them are certain, others can be named only with probability, while others, again, can only be guessed. Descending from the north, we find the following towns, which Livy, in his account of the second Punic war, distinctly affirms, were ruling cities: Volaterrae, Populonia, Rusellae, and Tarquinii; and in the interior,

Arretium, Perusia, Caere and Clusium. Four accordingly are wanting, either because they had perished, or because they had ceased to belong to the Etruscan nation. Veii and Vulsinii had been destroyed, and Capena had become a Roman municipium. But whether Capena ever was one of the sovereign cities, may seem doubtful. All these relations belong to so remote a period, and the notices we have of them in the ancient authors are so vague, that we must be extremely cautious. The case of Cortona is particularly doubtful. Livy, near the close of the first decad,[1] mentions it as an Etruscan town; but at the time of the second Punic war he does not name it among those which distinguished themselves by the support they gave to Scipio. Herodotus, in speaking of his own time, says that Cortona[2] was inhabited by Pelasgians who were foreign to the Tyrrhenians, that is, to the Etruscans and Ombricans. This is a great mystery, which it is impossible to solve with any degree of certainty. Had Cortona become Etruscan in the middle of the fifth century, while during the first half of the fourth it was still Tyrrhenian? or did Herodotus transfer to his own time that which was correctly applicable only to an earlier period? Different conjectures may be entertained as to why it is not mentioned in the second Punic war: Livy either forgot it, or the town had, perhaps, not been included in the general peace which the Etruscans concluded with the Romans at the time of the war with Pyrrhus; it is possible also that it may have concluded a separate peace, or that it had been conquered. For the books of Livy and Dionysius, containing the account of that period, are lost, and the brief extracts furnish no satisfactory information. We may, therefore, have recourse to several modes of explanation, but we must be cautious and not regard as certain what is merely possible.

One or two places at the least, therefore, are still wanting. On the coast we find Cossa, a large town, the walls of which still exist, and show that the place was strongly

[1] ix. 37. [2] Comp. *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 34, note 89.

fortified. But it is called Cossa Volcientium, whence it is probable that it was no more Etruscan than Falerii, which, geographically speaking, likewise belonged to Etruria. We may, however, take it almost for certain that Faesulae, situated beyond Florence, was one of the twelve towns. It is not indeed mentioned in the history of the wars with the Romans, that is, in the ninth and tenth books of Livy; but we can draw no inference from this, as the eleventh and twelfth books are wanting. From these last we should have learned, whether at that period it was one of the Etruscan towns or not.

In a physical point of view, Etruria may be divided into three parts. The central portion is formed by the main stock of the Apennines, both those in the neighbourhood of Siena and those in the north of the river Arno, for they belong together, having been separated only by the hand of man to make an opening for letting the Arno pass through. This part comprises the whole of the Apennines, which now separate Tuscany from Bologna and Romagna, together with the interior from the neighbourhood of Siena to the Roman towns of Aquapendente and Viterbo. This range of mountains contains indeed many beautiful valleys, but in some parts there are none, and on the frontiers of Tuscany and Bologna the country consists of rough, wild and inhospitable mountains, which at present have scarcely any wood at all; in ancient times it was different, for thick forests appear to have existed at least on the frontiers of Etruria and the country of the Gauls. The second part comprises the whole territory extending below Volterra, the so-called Maremma, or hilly coast land. It embraced the whole of *Suburbicaria Tuscia*, the modern Patrimonio di. S. Pietro, a district formerly containing the towns of Vulsinii and Saturnia, and at present Tuscanella and others, and extending to the very gates of Rome. The geological character of this part is quite different from that of the Apennines; it is of a volcanic nature, the lakes of Vulsinii, Bacanae, and all the others in that district are decayed

craters, and volcanic stones and productions of every kind are found there in all directions as on the opposite side of the Tiber. The country is at present extremely unhealthy, and was in all probability never quite healthy on account of the bad quality of the water; there seem to be really poisonous exhalations. In ancient times, however, important towns existed there notwithstanding, and there was no doubt a corresponding degree of agriculture; at the time when Florence and Siena were flourishing republics, the state of the country was likewise better than it is now. It was ruined by the princes of the house of Medici, who made the towns responsible for the whole amount of taxes, as is the custom in the East; when one place was decayed, the others had to make up the sum among themselves. In some parts this system was carried so far, that during the second half of the seventeenth century, under Cosmo III., whole villages were ruined; and it was the greatest misfortune for the country that this Cosmo reigned for a period of half a century. In this manner the country became desolate by fiscal extortions. Wherever the population has once become extinct, it rarely re-appears; the emperor Leopold II. did every thing in his power to mend matters, but it was of little avail. The third part comprising the marshy country from the Arno as far as the Gonfalina, is a large and low district with many marshes and lakes, extending as far as Luna and Pescia; it has quite the appearance of the countries in the Netherlands. In the time of Hannibal, it was one continuous marsh, but he made his way through it, and deceived the Romans, who thought it impossible for him to advance through that morass, and accordingly considered themselves quite safe. We may say in general that the manner, in which the Romans at that time carried on the war, was beneath all criticism. The upper Arno was formerly a lake, and near Faesulae, too, there was a lake, but they have been drained by making a passage for the waters through the Gonfalina and La'ncisa.

I shall now proceed to give you an account of the separate

towns, mentioning at once the things for which they were remarkable at different periods, for our time is too short accurately to separate the geography of the different periods.

LUCA. The northern part about Luca was afterwards in the hands of the Ligurians, and nothing is known about it in regard to the Etruscan period. Soon after the Hannibalian war, the town was taken by the Romans who established a colony there, for the purpose of securing the possession of the country. Throughout the middle ages, Luca was a place of considerable importance.

LUNA, situated on the sea-coast, in the neighbourhood of the modern Carrara, was anciently likewise Etruscan, and of importance to Rome on account of its excellent harbour. The whole coast of Etruria has but few harbours, and there is only one other at Populonia; but that of Luna had the advantage of being at once the nearest and very good. Before the Romans had formed a communication with Spain by land, the military communication with that country was kept up by means of the port of Luna; and the Romans had long been masters of the greater part of Spain, before the communication through Gaul was opened. Luna was also important on account of its quarries of white marble, called *marmor Lunense*. The Romans did not commence to work in marble till a very late period: before the time of Augustus it was not very extensively used, and he first erected buildings of native marble. During Cicero's youth the Romans began to employ Carystian and Numidian (yellow) marble in private houses, no doubt, for small pillars; and in the time of Pompey, the use of foreign marble became a little more common. But in the reign of Augustus it became very general, whence marbles of every kind are found in the ruins; Carrara marble was employed in vast quantities, the white Pentelian was less common. After the time of Augustus, it was customary to use bricks for the internal parts of walls, and to cover or incrustate, as the Italians say, the outside with slabs of marble. At a later

period of the empire this custom extended so far, that it became an indispensable luxury to cover the walls even of private houses with most costly kinds of marble. The temple of Apollo on the Palatine seems to have been constructed of solid Carrara marble. When the Romans advanced as far as Luna, the Etruscans were, probably, no longer masters of the place, but it seems to have belonged to the Ligurians. In the middle ages it was destroyed by the Saracens.

PISA also appears to have been Etruscan, but it never was a sovereign city. It is regarded as a colony of Pisa in Elis (whence *Pisae Alpheae* in Virgil); but this is a groundless fancy, and it is an undoubted fact that Pisa was an ancient Tyrrhenian place. In the Hannibalian war, it was an important military station to the Romans, who succeeded in remaining masters of it. Afterwards it became a military colony. The great importance of the place is manifest from the number of ruins and remains of every description, although the town is not often spoken of. In the middle ages it rose rapidly and became great at once, just as the gods in the Aeneid step forth from the clouds, without any one having anticipated them. In the eleventh century, when the Pisans constructed their cathedral with its baptistery and tower, Pisa must have been a city of gigantic power and greatness. Its inhabitants possessed a wonderful taste for the arts even during the darkest periods of the middle ages, when at Venice (I will not mention Rome which was quite barbarous) not the slightest trace of such a taste was perceptible. The Venetians, as late as the thirteenth century, melted down all the Greek works of art in bronze which they could carry away; the preservation of the colossal horses from Chios, in the Piazza S. Marco, is almost a mere accident: the strange deliberation as to whether they should be melted down or not, is well known. For half a century afterwards the horses stood neglected in some shed, until civilisation advanced, and they were set up in their present place. At Pisa, on the other hand, the taste

for the arts was so far developed that, as early as the eleventh century, the city employed an architect, probably from the south of France (his name is Bruschetti, as is stated in the excellent inscriptions), to build a church, which is as magnificent as any structure belonging to the period of the emperors of declining Rome, or of the Byzantine rulers. The Pisans, moreover, carefully collected during their expeditions, especially at Rome, columns and other antiquities, and obtained similar treasures as presents from the emperors. During the twelfth century they collected fragments of ancient architecture, sculptures, and especially sarcophagi which they put together in their cemetery (Campo Santo); they then surrounded the cemetery with a wall and a portico, and thus affectionately preserved the remains of antiquity. The bodies of men of rank were buried in these sarophagi. Such was the spirit in which Nicolo Pisano, a gigantic genius of the middle of the thirteenth century, made bas reliefs more beautiful than any that were produced at Rome during the third century of our era; not only does he show great genius in invention, but also in the beauty of his sculptures. The civic laws of the Pisans were based upon remnants of the Roman law, nay, edicts of praetors, which had not been introduced into the Justinianean Code, were preserved there; so that Pisa, at a later period, remained an essentially Roman city, though it was governed by a Lombard nobility. The vicissitudes of Pisa were terrible and deplorable. The Genoese overpowered and cruelly destroyed it: the more bravely and valiantly the city resisted, the more fearful was its destruction. Afterwards it was subdued by the Florentines. No republic ever carried the persecution of its subjects so far as Florence carried that of the Pisans. The Florentines distrusted them so much, that the Pisans were not only excluded from all honourable offices, but were not allowed even within their own city to practise certain professions or engage in certain trades; they were not allowed, e.g., to embrace the professions of physicians and lawyers, or to carry on a wholesale mercantile business, but they

were limited to the small and common trades. The consequence of this was an insurrection, but the Pisans were subdued, and of the 100,000 inhabitants which Pisa had had during the middle ages, not more than 8,000 remained at the time when Cosmo de Medici entered upon the government. Athens was in a similar state of decay during the period from Alexander to the last Philip of Macedonia.

VOLATERRAE, no doubt one of the ancient sovereign cities, was situated at some distance from the coast. In the history of the Roman wars, it acted a very prominent part; and from the vigorous manner in which it supported Scipio, we see what a powerful place it must have been; but it distinguished itself more especially by the resistance it offered to Sulla. When the fate of the whole Marian party was already decided, Volaterrae still sustained a war for two years, and did not surrender until it was compelled by want of provisions. We do not know what was the fate of the town, but we do know the character of the conqueror, and may therefore presume that it was a most fearful one. Sulla established a military colony there, and deprived the inhabitants of the franchise. The ancient circumference of the city can still be distinctly traced: it occupied all the surface of a very considerable hill, which rises above the lower hills of an almost level and beautiful country. The wall clearly shows the difference between the Pelasgo-Cyclopean and the more artistic Etruscan mode of fortification. The Etruscan fortifications were constructed along the upper edge of a hill as real walls, and the sides of the hill below the walls were not cut precipitous; the Pelasgian places, on the other hand, have no walls on the edge of the hills, but the sides of the rock are cut down so as to be precipitous, and are provided with substructions. Another difference consists in the fact, that the Etruscan walls are built of regular square blocks, forming parallelograms one perpendicularly above the other. The blocks are very large, and generally put together without cement, their edges being cut very sharp. The fortifications of

Volaterrae are among the most perfect. After the time of Sulla, or at least after that of Augustus, Volaterrae was a military colony. It was the birth-place of the poet Persius, who for this reason more than once alludes to the circumstances of his native place, and can be understood only by those who are acquainted with them. The hill on which Volaterrae stood, consists of alabaster, in consequence of which many works in that material were executed there; hence the sarcophagi of Volaterrae with Etruscan inscriptions, are made of alabaster. During the middle ages the town was still very considerable; but it has decayed, especially through the greatness of Florence.

The next place after Volaterrae in the south is POPULONIA, POPULONII or POPULONIUM, for all these forms occur. On Etruscan coins it is called *Puplana*, for the Etruscan alphabet has no *o* nor any short vowels. There is a statement which seems quite credible that Populonia was a colony of Volaterrae. In later times it was one of the more important Etruscan towns, and acted a prominent part in the wars against Rome, of which an account is given in the tenth book of Livy. It had the sovereignty of the neighbouring island of *Ilva* or *Aethalia*, a Greek name suggestive of its Pelasgian origin. The mountain of this island consists of large masses of iron, which by the Catalanian method can easily be transformed into the most excellent steel. The west of Europe was, to a great extent, provided with iron from Elba, as it was imported into the eastern parts from the Black Sea. The working of the mines of Elba, however, seems to be of a more recent date than the composition of the Odyssey, for in this poem the south of Italy is provided with iron from Temese. The ancients notice it as a singular phenomenon, that the iron could not be smelted in Elba, and that it was necessary to do this on the continent; but this is a Greek absurdity, and an inability to comprehend things connected with ordinary life, which we not unfrequently meet with in the ancients. It was reported in Greece, that it was necessary

to transport the iron to Populonia, and the imagination of the Greeks immediately invented a reason. The truth is simply this: in later times there was a want of wood in Elba, and it was found cheaper to convey the iron to Populonia, than to import wood into Elba, for Populonia possessed smelting establishments. In like manner, the copper ore found in Cornwall is conveyed to Wales and smelted there. Populonia was a wealthy maritime town until it was destroyed by Sulla; and from that time it has been a heap of ruins, which were seen by Strabo. The town was never restored.

The moderns who have written on ancient geography are tolerably unanimous in their opinions, that VETULONIUM was situated in the neighbourhood of Populonia. Dionysius mentions it as a large city, which carried on war against Rome, while Livy does not notice it either in the first decad, where he describes the great Etruscan war, or in his account of the Hannibalian war, or in any other place. It must accordingly have disappeared at a time of which we know nothing. There exist coins with Etruscan inscriptions, which unquestionably belong to Vetulonium. In a forest near Populonia large ruins are found, which have been assigned to Vetulonium, but this is a mere conjecture, and nothing can be said with any degree of certainty about the situation of the place. I have often thought, that it might possibly be Orviedo which was called *Urbs vetus* as early as the eighth century. However, the place has entirely disappeared, and all that is said about it rests on mere conjecture.

There now follow RUSELLAE and COSSA, the latter of which, as I have already observed, was probably not an Etruscan town; at a later time it received a Latin colony.

TARQUINII appears in our histories as an Etruscan town, but that in the most ancient times it was a real Tyrrhenian place, is attested by the tradition of its having been founded by Thessalians; the name Tarchon, which is mentioned as archegetes and is connected with Telephus, points in the

same direction. At the time when Tarquinii is drawn into the traditions about Rome, and connected with Tarquinius Priscus, it probably is still a Tyrrhenian town. In the war with Pyrrhus, Tarquinii, like nearly all the Etruscan towns, formed an alliance with Rome in a general peace, of which I shall speak in the third volume of my History of Rome. By this peace the Etruscan towns were placed in a relation to Rome quite different from that of the other towns of Italy, because the Romans were anxious to gratify their wishes in order to prevent their forming connections with Pyrrhus. This is one of the occurrences where Providence directly interferes in the affairs of the world for the purpose of saving a state from destruction. Such also was the peace between Russia and Turkey in 1812, whereby the French army was prevented from retreating to Turkey, and was thus left to its fate. In like manner, Soltikoff, after the battle of Kunersdorf, ordered his troops to stand still. The determination of the Etruscan towns to accept the peace of the Romans forms a similar turning point in ancient history. After this, Tarquinii remained faithful to Rome, until it disappeared in the time of the Roman emperors. In the age of Cicero it still existed; in the war of Sulla it was probably not destroyed, though severe sufferings may have been inflicted upon it. The site which it once occupied, the modern Corneto, is remarkable for the monuments which are discovered there, and are more numerous than in any other place of Etruria. They are made of clay, and are of a very peculiar character, approaching the Grecian style, while those found in the interior of Etruria are altogether different in workmanship from Greek monuments. The decay of Tarquinii must perhaps be ascribed to the choking up of its good harbour, and to the rise of *Centumcellae*, one of the few places in Italy the origin of which belongs to a late period. Until the time of Trajan no town existed there; it was only a summer palace of the emperor with a mineral spring, for that volcanic region contains many hot springs. Trajan, who in

general did much to promote the navigation of the Italians, built a harbour there, and constructed the *molo* which still forms the harbour of Civita Vecchia; and near it arose the town which received its name of Centumcellae from the imperial palace. The town continued to increase in importance, especially during the period of the decay of the empire, when the Portus of Rome became more and more filled up, while that of Centumcellae was capable of receiving larger ships. The Saracens took the place, but the inhabitants withdrew, and built in the interior of the country the town of *Leopolis*, named after pope Leo IV. When, in consequence of the victory of Ostia, the danger of the Saracens was removed, the inhabitants of Centumcellae returned, and from that time the town has been called *Civita Vecchia*. It is, therefore, not an Etruscan, but a Roman town.

CAERE with the port towns of *Fregenae*, *Alsium*, and *Pyrgi*, was situated nearer the mouth of the Tiber. Caere was anciently called *Agylla*, and as such it is said to have been Pelasgian or Thessalian: it is, moreover, expressly mentioned that the town was taken by the Etruscans. As later writers believed in the Lydian origin of the Etruscans, this misunderstanding gave rise to the account that Agylla was taken by the Lydians. Agylla existed as a Tyrrhenian town until a very late period. In the account of Herodotus, where the Phocaeans settle in Corsica, and are attacked and expelled by the Carthaginians and Agyllaeans, Agylla does not yet appear as an Etruscan town. When the Agyllaeans, after treating their captives treacherously, had experienced the wrath of heaven, they consulted the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, which no Etruscan town ever did; they, moreover had a *thesaurus* at Delphi, and the mention of *thesauri* there does not go farther back than the fortieth Olympiad. It must therefore have been after this time that the Etruscans advanced into those districts. The names of Pyrgi and Alsium also attest their Tyrrhenian origin. It is probable, lastly, that Caere, because of its Tyrrhenian origin, was on such friendly terms with Rome,

that during the Gallic calamity the Romans carried their sacred treasures in safety to Caere. Afterwards they were involved in a protracted war with each other; a truce was concluded and renewed from time to time, until Caere gradually entered the general relation in which the Etruscan towns stood to Rome. In this condition, we find Caere in the time of the Hannibalian war. Afterwards it is no longer mentioned, except that we find it entered as a Marian colony in the lists of colonies drawn up by Hyginus and Frontinus.

VEII was situated not quite ten English miles from Rome. Its circumference, according to Dionysius, was like that of Rome under Servius Tullius, and the same as the ancient Attic ἄστυ. However, it is scarcely credible that Dionysius should have possessed such accurate information about a town which had been razed to the ground long before his own time. It is well known, that Veii was destroyed by the Romans even before the Gallic period, because the plebeians had declared that they would emigrate to Veii, if the patricians thought them unworthy of being members of the same state. For this reason, the patricians and the senate systematically destroyed the place. Its site is undoubted, but scarcely any traces of Etruscan remains are found there. In the reign of Tiberius, we find it mentioned as a military colony, but we do not know when or how it was constituted as such. About thirty years ago, excavations were made on the spot, and some beautiful works of art, and among them a very fine statue of Tiberius, were discovered; but most of the things found there are not above mediocrity, and all the inscriptions refer to the restoration of the place by Tiberius. Henceforth, and down to the overthrow of the western empire, Veii remained a small country town in the neighbourhood of the capital. A bishop of Veii occurs as late as the fifth century. It is quite in accordance with the natural course of things, that places which were great before Rome rose to eminence, and for a time her equals, were in the end subdued and perished

in the wars with their rival. In places of this kind a new population gradually sprang up, and corporations were formed which were nothing else but military colonies, and could not last long, as most of the men were unmarried. Such a population was generally of the worst kind, consisting of inn-keepers, carters, and the like; the places were in reality suburbs of Rome, though at a considerable distance from it.

CAPENA was about the same distance from Rome as Veii; it is mentioned in the earlier times, but afterwards completely disappears, and its inhabitants, according to all appearances, were removed to Rome after the Punic war. SUTRIUM and NEPET were for a long time the frontier towns of Etruria towards the territory of Rome.

VULSINII, situated on lake Bolsena, was one of the largest Etruscan towns. When after the Gallic war we find Etruria in arms, we must suppose that the Vulsinians were the soul of those undertakings. They were involved in hostilities with Rome even before the Gallic war; afterwards they are, for a time, not mentioned at all, whence their relations with Rome seem to have ceased; the frontier heights between Rome and Etruria were allowed to grow wild and to become covered with an impenetrable forest, as has been the case in modern times in the neighbourhood of Licca, on the frontier between Croatia and Turkish Bosnia. This is the *Ciminian forest,* the description of which in Livy is exaggerated in a ridiculous manner; it often happens that his great imaginative power leads him to make descriptions which would be excellent in a novel, but are ludicrous in a work where truth is the object. The history of Vulsinii is remarkable both for its facts and for its fables. It is a fact that ever since A. U. 440, and for a period of thirty years, Vulsinii offered a resistance to the Romans, which larger Etruscan towns recoiled from, and that at length Rome, in the height of her power, when she was the mistress of Italy, with difficulty conquered and then destroyed it. In later times it re-appears, for Sejanus was a

native of Vulsinii. Metrodorus of Scepsis says that the real cause of the destruction of Vulsinii was the circumstance that the Romans wanted to obtain possession of 2000 magnificent statues which existed there. This is a fable, and no doubt the view of a Greek, which he attributed to the Romans. The latter were far from attaching such value to works of art; gold and silver were the things they sought after. The real reason was that Vulsinii, by its thirty years' resistance, had distinguished itself above all Etruscan tribes; and the Romans, therefore, were determined to take the sap out of the tree, so as to prevent its ever growing again. The ancient inhabitants had called in the Romans against their slaves. These slaves, however, must not be understood to have been domestic slaves, but serfs, or the subdued ancient population, whom elsewhere the Etruscan magnates kept in servitude, while the Vulsinians had given them freedom and the franchise. The commonalty, having thus become free, did not stop short there, but, indignant at the ancient wrong done to them, they attacked their former tyrants; they did not, however, expel, but only weakened them. The latter then applied to Rome, and preferred having their town destroyed to living on a footing of equality with the commonalty. The correct spelling of the name is *Vulsinii* and not *Volsinii*, for, as I have already mentioned, the Etruscans had no *o*; hence we find *Vulsinii* in the Capitoline Fasti, though in genuine Roman words it is more correct to write *o* after *v*, as *volnus* and not *vulnus*.

In the centre of Etruria there was no ruling city, nay, no Etruscan place at all. Augustus established there *Sena Julia* as a military colony, the sixth legion being stationed there. As there was no road through the centre of the country, but only one along the coast, and another through the eastern part, Augustus made the one running by Aquapendente.

The Etruscan towns in the eastern part of the country

were Clusium, Perusia, Cortona (though its Etruscan character is doubtful), Arretium, and Faesulae.

The greatness of CLUSIUM belongs to the most ancient times, for in Roman history it is not of any importance; nor do the Romans mention any ruins of Clusium, for all that is related of the buildings of Porsena, belongs to the domain of fable.

PERUSIA was situated east of Clusium. During the period described in the ninth and tenth books of Livy, Perusia acts the same part as the other Etruscan towns; but after having suffered a defeat, it concluded a truce. The Perusines undertook the war in a foolish manner, and the first reverse discouraged them. Here, too, a military colony was afterwards established, probably by Sulla. The town is remarkable in history for the obstinate resistance it offered to Augustus, as in fact the descendants of Sulla's soldiers in the military colonies were almost everywhere opposed to the party of Caesar. The town was taken and the most illustrious citizens put to death, or rather butchered, at the altar of Julius Caesar. Afterwards a new military colony was sent thither under the name of *Colonia Julia Augusta Perusina.*

CORTONA, also a military colony, probably likewise founded by Sulla, was situated on a very high hill and in a very strong position. Its ancient walls do not appear to have been particularly strong.

ARRETIUM was more important than Cortona, and probably one of the largest cities of Etruria. Its greatness may be inferred from the fact that in the Hannibalian war it furnished arms for 30,000 men of the army of Scipio. We must not, however, conceive these towns to have been confined to their own territories, but as sovereigns of districts of many square miles, whence they were able to do things which seem to us impossible. Arretium was an industrial place, and rich by its manufactures, especially its potteries, like Staffordshire in England; whence Augustus, in a fragment of a letter to Maecenas, calls him a Tuscan potter.

Augustus often tried to be witty, but his witticisms were mostly dull. The pottery of Arretium was highly valued even during the middle ages, though otherwise few collections were made. At present such vessels are extremely rare: I have brought with me from Italy a small piece as a relic, for I am not rich enough to purchase an entire Arretine vase. They are not painted, but have figures, leaves, animals, and the like, in relief, and are of exquisite beauty. Arretium completely shared the fate of Etruria itself. There were three different Arretiums, *vetus*, *fidens* and *Julium*. Sulla destroyed the city, sold its inhabitants as slaves, and founded in the vicinity a new colony for his soldiers, under the name of *Arretium fidens*. Augustus built *Arretium Julium* in the neighbourhood of the two others. The modern Arezzo occupies the site of Arretium Julium, whence it contains no Etruscan antiquities; but the Roman town was much more important than the present Arezzo. If systematic excavations were made in the neighbourhood, many things might certainly be discovered. I regret not having visited the Grand Duke of Tuscany, an excellent young man, full of taste for, and appreciation of, knowledge, for I might perhaps have induced him to make excavations, especially near Arezzo and Chiusi.

FAESULAE was situated on a hill above Florence. Florentine traditions call it the metropolis of Florence, which would accordingly be a colony of Faesulae; but a statement in Machiavelli and others describes Florence as a colony of Sulla, and this statement must have been derived from some local chronicle. Faesulae was no doubt an ancient Etruscan town, probably one of the twelve. It was taken in the war of Sulla, and was then in the same desperate condition as Arretium and Volaterrae, both of which were deprived by Sulla of their freedom and territory. Hence a Sullanian colony is mentioned by Cicero as existing there in the war of Catiline. My conjecture is, that Sulla not only built a strong fort on the top of the hill of Faesulae, but also the new colony of Florentia below, and gave to it the *ager*

Faesulanus. If this be true, the statement before alluded to would be correct, though we cannot trace it to any authentic source. The Etruscans built their towns on inaccessible hills in order to be able to control their subjects; the Romans not being under this necessity, built their towns in convenient and accessible places, to which they could make roads. Facsulae could not be reached, except on foot or on horseback; no vehicle could get up the hill, whereas the Romans employed many vehicles in the intercourse among the towns. But although Florentia was a colony of Sulla, the *agrimensores* subsequently describe it as a colony of the triumvirs, and it is indeed possible that not one of the twenty-eight military colonies of Sulla may have been kept up until the time of the triumvirs. This subject is in the greatest confusion, and no one has yet attempted to clear it up. First we have the colonies of the republic, then the military colonies of Sulla, then again a second series of military colonies under Caesar, and lastly those of the triumvirs and Augustus. The earlier colonies lost their character through the Lex Julia, and became municipia; then followed the Sullanian and Julian colonies, so that the same place at three different times may have had three different colonies. This view of the matter makes clear that which Cluver and Cellarius, with all their merits, have left in utter confusion.

Within the territory of Tuscia or Etruria, we find on the banks of the Tiber a place, or rather a tribe, which in all our maps is described as a part of Etruria, but which the ancients, Strabo, e. g., expressly say did not belong to Etruria. This is the people of the FALISCANS. Respecting their nationality, the ancients have in reality only this negative statement, and we cannot ascertain to what race they belonged, except by divination and indirect evidence. Virgil in his Aeneid speaks of *Aequi Falisci*, which the commentators, and even the ancient scholiasts, taking *Aequi* as an adjective, translate "just Faliscans"; but it is highly probable that *Aequi* is a name, and that we have to

regard the expression in the same light as, e. g., *Chaonii Campi*, where Campi is explained even by the scholiasts as the name of a people. The identity of the Aequians and Faliscans is confirmed also by other evidence. Among the Faliscans we find the word *hirpus*, whence their language may be inferred to be a branch of the Oscan, in which, as we have seen, this word signifies a wolf. Lastly, the name of the Faliscans may be traced at once to that of the Volscians, *Volsci*, *Volisci*, *Falisci*; and as we know that they were of foreign, that is, non-Etruscan origin, we cannot, considering the geographical position of the people, doubt the correctness of the view here expounded. There is some plausibility also in the other tradition which is traced to Cato, that the country, before it was taken possession of by the Faliscans, was inhabited by Siculians. This quite agrees with our supposition of successive conquests. The most ancient inhabitants were Pelasgians, who were succeeded by an Ausonian people, and the latter again are pushed onward by the Sabines; for it should be observed, that the Sabines did not penetrate between these Faliscans and Aequians and the Volscians until a later period.

The Faliscans had several towns, of which FALERII was the most important. For reasons which are quite unknown to us, the Romans, after the first Punic war, conquered and destroyed this town. This fact is all we know; but we may suppose that the place, to escape from oppression, was tempted to a rash and inconsiderate act, for the condition of Italy was then such as to render any undertaking against Rome hopeless. The town was afterwards restored. Near Civita Castellana, there is a place called Falera, which is no doubt the ancient Falerii; Faliscan inscriptions are still found there. It was a deeply rooted mistake among the first scholars after the revival of letters, to suppose that Civita Castellana was the ancient Veii; but this error was refuted even by Lucas Holstenius. The real town of Falerii was situated a little to the east of it.

Mount SORACTE, which is always visible from Rome,

was in the country of the Faliscans. Horace, in one of his Odes, speaks of Soracte as being covered with snow, and this has given rise to the erroneous inference, that the climate of Rome is now changed and milder than in antiquity. The Abruzzi, Leonessa, and other heights, may be covered with snow, without its being cold at Rome, but when there is snow on mount Soracte the cold at Rome is severe. This is indeed not often the case; but when it does happen, the snow-capped Soracte is seen very distinctly from Rome. Horace has not availed himself of a poetical license in this respect. I mention this, because people, very frequently, if not generally, speak of poetical license as if an inaccurate expression in a poet ought to be pardoned. There may, indeed, be poets of this kind, as, for example, Ausonius, and Greek poets of the period of decay; and modern poets, too, very frequently make use of such licenses; but is is quite certain that the good poets of antiquity give to things only such epithets as are quite clear and true to their own minds.

UMBRIA.

Of this country I have little to say. Umbria, in its proper sense, in which the name is used by the Romans, is situated for the most part in the Apennines, though we cannot even positively assert that it extended to the southern slope of the Apennines. But in more ancient times it extended much farther on both sides. There is great probability in the tradition that the Umbrians were confined to their small territory by the Etruscans, who are said to have taken 300 Umbrian towns. This number, however, must not be taken literally, for it is only a general number like *μυρίοι* and *sexcenti*. Its earlier and larger extent is also attested

by the river Umbro in the territory of Siena, and by the fact, that even at a later time a part of Etruria continued to be called Umbria. At one period the Umbrians also possessed the whole country about Rimini as far as the mouth of the Padus; there they were either expelled or subdued by the Gauls, or, as is still more probable, completely extirpated, for the Gauls were most fearful enemies and barbarians in the strictest sense of the term, annihilating and devastating everything that came in their way. During the Roman period, the Umbrians were extremely weak, and down to the fifth century, when the Romans came in contact with them, they were no doubt tributary to the Gauls. What could they in fact have done against such an enemy? They were obliged either to repel them or pay tribute to them. We know that other neighbouring tribes did so, whence it is probable that the Umbrians did the same. The Gauls, who so often advanced to the lower Tiber, cannot have come through any other country but Umbria, for the Etruscans in their towns defended themselves against them, and were protected in the north by the Apennines. Hence the unfortunate country of Umbria had constantly to suffer from the passages of the Gauls, who, in like manner, always took their road to Apulia through Picenum.

At the time when the Umbrians come in contact with the Romans, they seem to act as one nation, though it does not follow from this that they actually formed one state. A fact, however, which may seem to support this view is, that the different districts of the country are mentioned under the name of *tribus* or *plagae* (*tribus Materina, Sapinia*), which denote parts of one great whole. Yet this union, if it did exist, can have embraced only a portion, for the Sarsinates, or Sassinates, stood apart, and in the war of Pyrrhus they alone, for a time, defended their independence against the Romans. The Umbrians allowed themselves to become involved in the war of the Samnites and Gauls, but appear to have carried it on without energy;

and a treaty seems to have been concluded with them similar to that with the Etruscans, for both are mentioned among the nations which supported Scipio. I am well aware that Italicans did the same, but they did it in a different manner.

Several of the Umbrian towns were made Roman colonies, especially *Spoletium* and *Narnia*, previously called *Nequinum*; both places were fortified by the Romans (Narnia after the second Samnite war, and Spoletium afterwards), for the purpose of keeping the country in subjection, and of protecting the frontier against the Gauls.

All Umbria was full of towns: *Hispellum*, *Tuder*, *Fulginium*, *Assisium*, *Camerinum*, and *Iguvium* (Gubbio), were places of considerable importance. In the last of them, tables have been dug out of the ground with inscriptions in Etruscan and in another language in Latin characters; the latter language seems to resemble the Latin and Oscan. When once the Oscan language shall be better known, more light will perhaps be thrown upon the Umbrian language also. The name *Umbria* and the Greek *Ὀμβρικοὶ* seem actually to be akin to *Ὀπικοί*, which is in fact intimated in a passage of Philistus; whence the Umbrians probably belonged to the great Ausonian race. So far as I have seen Umbria, it is a very excellent and picturesque country; the Apennines are there much more beautiful than in Tuscany; they are covered with particularly fine forests, and have magnificent, rich, and fertile valleys. All the rest of Italy is ill-suited to the breeding of oxen, but Umbria has the most splendid kinds: I have seen a herd of white oxen near the well of Clitumnus, which consisted of the finest and noblest animals of the kind; they were like those in southern Poland and Russia. The cattle here in Germany is wretched. The extension and change of the races of animals in Italy may be traced back to the times of antiquity: buffaloes, for example, were introduced into Campania in the seventh century, when the country was almost a wilderness.

Gallia Cisalpina or Togata.

Down to the middle of the fourth century, the country beyond the Apennines was called northern Etruria, but after that time it bore the name *Gallia Cisalpina* or *Togata,* but it extended further than Etruria proper, for the sea-coast as far as the river Aesis never belonged to Etruria.

The country now called Lombardy in its narrower sense, was inhabited in the earliest times by Ligurians, as is clear from most indubitable indications, and hence we must suppose, that subsequently they were driven by the Etruscans across the Ticinus. But these events belong to too remote an epoch, and I cannot say much either of this or of the Etruscan period. Certain it is that Etruscan towns existed in those parts, and that Etruscans dwelt there as the conquerors of the Ligurians and as the lords of the land; and there can be no doubt that after descending from the Alps the Etruscans established their first settlements there. *Melpum* is said to have been a great Etruscan settlement in the neighbourhood of Milan; and *Felsina* (Bononia), *Mutina*, *Parma*, and *Brixia*, are spoken of in the same way. *Verona* is sometimes called Raetian and sometimes Etruscan, and *Mantua* is called Etruscan by Virgil. It is possible that Verona may have been termed Raetian because it was situated on the Raetian frontier, and may for all this have been an Etruscan town.

The immigration of the Gauls into those parts is assigned by Livy in a most unhistorical manner to the time of Tarquinius Priscus; he has no other reason for it than the very legendary connection supposed to have existed between this emigration of the Gauls, and the settlement of the Phocaeans at Massilia. There is much more probability in the statement, that not long before the attack upon Rome by the Senones, the Gauls had first poured down upon all Italy in great masses. This is supported by the express

testimony of Polybius, that they had shortly before come across the Alps, and also by the tradition that they took Melpum in the same year in which Veii was taken by Camillus (358). Just at that time, the Etruscans on quitting Veii seem to have turned their attention to an object of greater interest in a different direction. About that same time the Gauls appear in Slavonia and Lower Hungary, where they stirred up the Triballians, and according to an ancient tradition the Gauls migrated at the same time across the Alps and across the Rhine. They evidently marched into Italy through Switzerland, which may previously have been inhabited by quite different tribes. The ruins on the Ottilienberg in Alsace have a complete Etruscan appearance; they strongly resemble the fortifications of Volaterrae, and are situated on the plateau of a hill: they are altogether foreign to the Celtic character; the Celts had nothing of the kind. The supposition of the antiquarians of Alsace, ever since the time of Schoepflin, that, as those ruins are not Celtic, they belong to the decaying period of Rome, perhaps the reign of Valentinian, is extremely unfortunate. These ruins are far more ancient than the Celtic period, and belong to a people, which was expelled by the Gauls. The great Gallic migration was a mighty commotion extending from the frontiers of Spain to the Ukraine. In the subsequent counter-movement of the Slavonic migrations, the Gauls were driven back from east to west; and then they appear under the name of Cimbri together with the Germanic nation of the Teutones, and return to their ancient homes as ravaging conquerors.

The Gauls who settled south of the Alps consisted of several tribes, partly entire and partly ἀποδασμοὶ of those of which a portion remained behind in Gaul. In this light we must view the *Boians*; very few of them may have remained in Gaul itself; the greater part advanced into the country south of the Po, and another branch settled in Bavaria and Bohemia. On the whole there were about four or five Gallic tribes which settled in Italy on both sides of

the Po; but besides them large numbers of volunteers, individuals and roaming vagabonds joined and strengthened one tribe or the other. I shall enumerate them in the order in which we find them established, beginning in the west. The Ticinus forms the frontier between the Gauls and Ligurians, as it still forms that between the territories of Milan and Piedmont.

1. The INSUBRIANS, in the modern territory of Milan proper.

2. The CENOMANIANS, in the territory of Brescia and Bergamo, between lake Garda and the mouth of the Po.

3. The BOIANS, in the south of the latter; their territory is made too small in all our maps; they occupied the county from Piacenza to the sea, including Parma, Modena, Reggio, Bologna and Ferrara. They were divided, according to Cato, into 112 pagi.

4. The SENONES, in the modern Romagna and Urbino, as far as the Aesis and the frontiers of Picenum.

5. The LINGONES must have occupied the country to the north of the former, that is Ferrara and the territory of Rovigo.

In the later political geography of the Romans, Gallia Cisalpina is divided into two parts which are very different from each other, viz., *Gallia Cispadana* and *Gallia Transpadana*. In political terminology the latter acquired a greater extent, not being limited to the country between the Ticinus and lake Garda, but also comprising Venetia. The inhabitants of all this country, who received the *jus Latii*, were called *Transpadani*. The *Cispadani* are not much spoken of, which arose from particular circumstances, which I will explain to you because history does not do it. I have mentioned to you, that the whole country south of the Po, from Piacenza to the frontier of Picenum, was inhabited by two Gallic tribes, the Boians and Senones. The Senones were extirpated to a man, as, e.g., the Eretrians were extirpated by the Persians. The Romans invaded their country, burnt down their villages, and carried off

their women and children into slavery; the men, capable of bearing arms, who in their despair returned, like beasts of prey whose young ones are taken from them, to save their families, were completely defeated, and those who escaped fled to the Boians. The whole of modern Romagna became a complete desert, such as we sometimes find in the history of Germany, e.g., the desert of the Avars in the time of Charlemagne, and Servia, after its devastation by Attila, when it was in such a condition that the ambassadors of Theodosius II. travelled seven days without finding any other traces of man, except the bodies of the murdered inhabitants. After its devastation, the Romans gave up the country partly to Roman citizens and partly to Italicans, who might cultivate it as they pleased, for it had become *ager publicus*. C. Flaminius afterwards distributed a portion of it *viritim* among Roman citizens. There now arose in those extensive districts entirely new settlements, the names of which are of a peculiar character: *Faventia Pollentia*, *Florentia* and *Placentia* are all names derived from verbs implying a favourable omen. Other places are termed *Fora*, and according to the American practice they might be called territories; they were inhabited by Roman citizens, who fully enjoyed the benefits of the Roman law, but did not form corporations. They lived isolated from one another, and thus were deprived of that advantage which was so important in antiquity, I mean, of the privileges of corporations: they had no magistrates to administer justice, whence there were many acts which they could not perform at all. It was contrary to the feelings of the Romans to appoint magistrates according to districts, and it was for this reason that they instituted Fora, places in which court-houses were built, and where a praefect, appointed by the practor urbanus, resided, and where, accordingly, judicial business could be transacted.

The Boians survived the Senones about ninety years; during the Hannibalian war, they were enraged against the Romans, who, by fortifying and colonising Placentia and Cremona,

had planted the yoke upon their necks, but the vengeance of the Romans was such, that in the course of about ten years they extirpated the whole Boian nation. A fragment of Cato in Pliny (iii. 15) furnishes express testimony on this subject, and the account in Livy, too, speaks distinctly enough. After this, no Boians are mentioned in Italy. In treating of Roman history, and especially of the *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina*, the question often presents itself to us, how it happens that in Cicero's time we hear such frequent mention of Gallia Transpadana, while Gallia Cispadana is never spoken of. The matter is explained by what I have said. The Gallic population of the latter was utterly annihilated; in regard to the Senones, it is expressly attested, and the survivors of the Boians were not more numerous than, for example, those of the Indian tribes in America. The whole country then was taken possession of by Romans and Italicans in the manner before described, and several colonies, such as Mutina, Bononia, Parma, etc., were established in it; the country, however, was partly *ager publicus* and partly *ager divisus*. In this manner, the whole country south of the Po was severed from Gaul, and all that remained of Gaul consisted of a small territory north of the Po, between the Ticinus and the lake of Garda; and this latter is the country of the Insubrians and Cenomanians, who, together with the Venetians, formed those Transpadani, who, through Cn. Pompeius Strabo, obtained the *jus Latii* of the later kind.

The following are the towns in the territory of Gallia Cispadana, proceeding from west to east:—PLACENTIA, the first Roman colony in those districts, was established two years before Hannibal's passage over the Alps. Like Cremona, it was situated on the northern bank of the river, and its fortification was one of the most energetic measures for maintaining the Roman dominion in those parts.

PARMA, a Latin colony, was founded like MUTINA after the Hannibalian war.

BONONIA, anciently called Felsina, and at present Bologna,

was a remarkable place even in antiquity on account of its favourable situation, though it can in no way be compared with what it was during its subsequent greatness. We may estimate its ancient circumference with tolerable accuracy from the extent of the town in the middle ages, which, however, was scarcely the fifth part of what it is at present.

In the subsequent province of Flaminia, which ever since the time of the exarchate was called *Romania* (Romagna), there existed several towns between Bologna and Rimini, such as *Faventia*, *Forum Cornelii*, *Forum Popillii*, and others. Most of them were as ancient as the time of the Roman republic, but their history is unimportant. Ever since the beginning of the exarchate, their sad celebrity is that their defence and conquest are much spoken of.

RAVENNA, the centre of the whole province of Flaminia, was originally a Pelasgian town, and is called Thessalian. In ancient times, it was situated, like Venice, in a lagoon, an arm of the sea extending from the mouth of the Po to the south of Rimini. Ravenna was built there on stakes like Venice. Such continued to be its condition in the time of the Roman emperors. It was inaccessible from the main land, from which it was separated by that arm of the sea, or rather by so shallow a marsh that persons could reach the city only with very flat boats, and not without a very accurate knowledge of the shallows. This strong position was probably the reason why Ravenna subsequently became the seat of the imperial government, for no place in Italy was considered sufficiently strong even when protected by a courageous garrison. Ravenna at that time was situated in the midst of the sea, and the streets were formed, as at Venice, by means of canals, by which the communication between its various parts was mainly kept up. A suburb of the name of *Classes* was situated on the main land opposite. The lagoons have gradually been filled up. During the Pelasgian period, the arm of the sea may have been deep, but in the middle ages it was filled up. A pier was constructed between Ravenna and

the suburb Classes (near it was the military port, whence the name Classes), and this pier seems to have greatly contributed to the filling up of the lagoons. When Belisarius made war on the Goths, Ravenna was still situated on the sea, but during the middle ages the sea vanishes, and the history of this gradual change can be accurately traced in documents. At present Ravenna is not only not a maritime town, and without a trace of its ancient canals, but it is situated, like Mexico, at a distance of from one and a half to two Roman miles from the sea, and near Classes not a trace of a harbour is left. Ravenna's greatness belongs to the period of Rome's decay. As early as the time of Augustus, a fleet was stationed there for the purpose of enabling the Romans, in case of a war or an insurrection, speedily to convey troops to the frontiers of Noricum, and to Pannonia; and afterwards a fleet was always ready there. In the time of Theodosius and Honorius, the town became important as the seat of government; under the Goths, too, it was the capital notwithstanding the unpleasantness of its situation; during the period of the Lombards it was the seat of the exarch or Greek governor of Italy. Hence the many extremely remarkable buildings, which still distinguish Ravenna from all other towns, and there is no place possessing so many edifices erected at a time when otherwise very little was done in the way of building. At the time when Ravenna became a capital, it had probably not yet reached its full extent; and as its population greatly increased, it was necessary to enlarge and embellish the place. Its decay began when it ceased to be the seat of the exarch. The town is remarkable also in the history of the Roman law, for notwithstanding its conquest by the Lombards, it never assumed the character of a Germanic town. Hence it became the seat of the grammatical and juristical schools, in which ancient literature continued to be taught. The form in which the ancient scholiasts have come down to us seems generally, speaking, to have been given to them in

the school at Ravenna. Savigny has shown that the Roman law was taught there until the eleventh century, and that its juristical school was not transferred to Bologna till the time when the Roman law became established beyond the frontiers of Italy.

The ancient town of ARIMINUM (Rimini) is situated to the south-east of Ravenna; it was a Latin colony established about the end of the fifth century as a frontier fortress and a place of arms to protect the Romans against the Cisalpine Gauls. The town is frequently mentioned in history, especially during the Hannibalian and Gallic wars. The Romans there awaited the invasion of the Gauls, the Apennines being impassable. A friend once told me that he had always pronounced the name Arimīnum, until many years ago his attention was directed to a passage of Lucan, which shewed him that it ought to be pronounced Arimĭnum. Lucan is sometimes useful in teaching us the correct pronunciation of names of places, which do not elsewhere occur in poetry. Otherwise he is, on the whole, not a pleasing writer, though in some points he contains valuable information, but he is not sufficiently polished. It was through his poem, that the gap in the second book of Caesar's "Bellum Civile" was discovered. But the most useless of all writers is Silius Italicus, and yet some things may be gleaned even from his works; no ancient author, in fact, is so bad, as not to furnish us with some useful information.

Further south on the coast, we find the towns of *Pisaurum*, *Fanum*, and *Sena Gallia*, of which scarcely any thing is to be said.

GALLIA TRANSPADANA. The INSUBRIANS occupied almost exactly the modern territory of Milan, for Ticinum was regarded as one of the Ligurian towns. Comum also did not belong to Gallia Transpadana, which comprised Milan, Lodi, and a part of the territory of Cremona. During the 200 years in which the Gauls were masters of that district, it contained, properly speaking,

no towns, and MEDIOLANUM, the principal place of the Insubrians, was an open village, though it may have been very large. The Romans treated the Insubrians more gently than the Boians, whence their country was not so cruelly devastated. In consequence of its relation to Rome, the village of Mediolanum became a town; but when or how this happened, we have no means of ascertaining. In the time of Caesar and Cicero, Mediolanum is already mentioned as a town, and, according to the description of Strabo, it appears to have even been a considerable one. The district of Milan is extremely fertile; its vicissitudes have been terrible, but it has always been restored, the causes of which must probably be sought in the particularly favorable circumstances of its situation. It is certainly not owing to the peculiar character of its inhabitants, of whom antiquity did not entertain any more favorable opinion than that which is current about the modern Milanese, who are said to be the most lazy and awkward among all the Italians. The atmosphere is heavy, and both ancients and moderns assert, that this has a great influence upon the inhabitants. Now this town of Milan which in the time of Strabo appears as a considerable country town, ever continued to increase under the emperors. In the letters of Pliny we find it spoken of as a large place, in which, according to the custom of the time, public teachers of rhetoric and grammar were appointed and salaried, and formed what we might call a university. During the second century Milan became larger and larger. In the war of the emperor Aurelian with the Goths, it was devastated, but soon recovered again. The emperor Maximian took up his residence there, so that it became a capital of the empire. Ausonius who lived about eighty years later says, *Mediolani mira omnia*, and *mirus* at that time signified "beautiful" or "magnificent." In the reign of Theodoric it was a very large and important city, though this emperor did not reside there. In the war of Belisarius its fate was very melancholy: Datius, the bishop of Milan, had been intriguing with the

imperial general and promised to deliver up Milan to him; but the plan was betrayed, the Goths entered Milan, and, if we can take the account in Procopius literally, put the whole population to the sword. The calamity must indeed have been fearful, though it can scarcely have been as bad as it is said to have been. In the time of the Lombards we again find it as a great city, though it was under a disadvantage because Pavia, in its neighbourhood, was the capital of the Lombards; and a rivalry between those two cities continued to exist until a late period of the middle ages. This kind of hostility was quite common among the Italian towns. In the case of large cities, this feeling may to some extent be excused, though it cannot be justified; but at present, when those towns are altogether devoid of character, that hatred is the only thing which has been propagated to them from better and more glorious times. Verona was the first Italian town in which I made a stay, and in which I had any conversation with the people; they very soon began to speak contemptuously of the other cities, to each of which some abusive name was applied. Such were the first things I heard in Italy; the idea that they are all countrymen and Italians is treated by them with ridicule; and even the inhabitants of different towns under the same sovereign have no fellow-feeling. When you speak to a Milanese, you find that he does not regard the Veronese as his countrymen; the inhabitants of some districts in Tuscany appear to him much more in that light, and he feels as foreign to the Lombards as to the French. It is distressing to see this distracted state of Italy. A Florentine treats it as a heresy and flies into a passion, when you speak to him of a *favella Italiana*, he cannot hear of anything but a *favella Toscana*. It is well known, that the emperor Frederic Barbarossa afterwards destroyed Milan, and compelled the inhabitants to live in five scattered villages; but they returned nevertheless. Subsequently, the wars at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century brought such severe sufferings upon

Milan, that it would necessarily have perished, if this were possible. It fell into the hands of the Spaniards, and in the sixteenth century was visited by a plague which carried off three-fifths of its inhabitants. In the seventeenth century, the plague again made sad ravages, and destroyed half the population. At present, it is still constantly increasing. He who has a taste for classical antiquity cannot regard these Lombard towns as belonging to it; for their importance does not commence until the decline of the Romans.

COMUM was situated at a distance of about twenty miles from Milan; it was a town of Alpine tribes of the Raetian race, and not Gallic. The modern Como is not the same as the ancient Comum, but is identical with the *Novocomum* of ancient geography which was founded and honored with privileges at a later period by Cn. Pompeius Strabo and Julius Caesar.

BERGAMUM also was not a Gallic town, but belonged to the mountain tribes of the district. Brixia, like the whole district between Lodi and Mantua belonged to the Cenomani.

LAUS POMPEIA, now Lodi, was founded by Cn. Pompeius Strabo, not, however, as a Roman town, but "as a colony in a place already existing" in the Roman dominion.[1]

BRIXIA is called a Cenomanian town, but it must not be inferred from this that the Cenomani occupied the whole territory of Brixia, for the whole valley of the Camuni was Raetian. The conquering Gauls did not dwell in the mountains, but in the plains fitted for the breeding of cattle and their rude agriculture. If we draw a line from lake Garda to Brixia, and thence northward towards the Adda, so as to separate Bergamum from the country of the Gauls, all the country north of that line did not belong to Italy before the time of Augustus, not even in its wider

[1] The words in inverted commas have been supplied by me; comp. Ascon. *Comm in Pison.*, p. 3, ed Orelli.—ED.

sense, but to the Alpine tribes. Catullus says of Brescia *Veronae mater amata meae,* which is unaccountable, for Verona was a small Gallic town. It is possible that Brixia may have been the seat of a conventus, somewhat in the same relation in which the metropolis in Asia Minor stood to the other towns; this is probable enough, or else Catullus alludes to the ancient Etruscan times, in which case Brixia would be the mother city of Verona.

MANTUA, according to Virgil (*Tusco de sanguine vires*) a Tuscan town; the manner in which he speaks of it, shows that it was a town with a territory, which was divided into twelve districts. Although he describes it as a considerable town, it does not appear in this light, and we must probably make some allowance for the poet's partiality for his native city. Its territory, however, may have been extensive, as is evident from the fact that it was contiguous to that of Cremona.

VERONA, to the north of Mantua, is remarkable because for a considerable period it was the seat of the Lombard kings, as before it had been the residence of Theodoric, who in the German lays is called Dietrich of Bern. There can be no doubt that the name of this far-famed chivalrous town was transferred to Berne in Switzerland, which was built by duke Berthold of Zähringen. Its ancient circumference may still be recognised, and from it we see how small those towns in the north of Italy were during the imperial period, in comparison with what they were in the middle ages. The whole of Lombardy, Tuscany, and Venice were far more flourishing in the middle ages than at any period in classical antiquity. If we compare Italy during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries with what it was in the days of Cicero, it is as a garden compared with a desert. The ancient town of Verona occupied scarcely one-fourth of the extent which it had in the time of the princes of Della Scalla; it still has the same circumference, but is desolate notwithstanding its 60,000

inhabitants. However, that Verona was a great and wealthy town even in antiquity, may be seen from the splendid gate of the emperor Gallienus (which also shews that it was a Roman colony), and from the splendid amphitheatre. Its fate has not been so disastrous as that of Milan; for throughout the middle ages it was not visited by a single great calamity. It is singular to observe how some towns are ever visited by misfortunes, while others are spared. Verona has acquired immortal celebrity from being the birth-place of Catullus, who and Lucretius are unquestionably the greatest Roman poets. The name C. Valerius is surprising, and people have been foolish enough to connect it with the ancient Valerian gens; but the fact is, that in the seventh century the Veronese must have had some Valerius for their patron. The name is extremely common on the stones which are dug out in the neighbourhood of Verona, and I have seen the name Valerius with different cognomina on at least twelve or fifteen of them. In antiquity the town was situated on a reach of the Athesis (Adige), but it now occupies both sides of the river.

In the division made by Augustus, Verona was contained in the Regio Veneta, but it is only in an improper sense that it can be said to have belonged to the nation of the VENETI. No ancient writer distinctly states to what race the Veneti belonged. They are said to have resembled the Illyrians in dress and manners; but the very way in which this statement is made, shows that its author did not regard them as Illyrians. Polybius assuredly knew how to distinguish the Illyrian language, as well as people in northern Germany can distinguish the Slavonian language without having themselves any knowledge of it. I have no doubt that the Veneti belonged to the race of the Liburnians, and that accordingly they were a branch of the wide-spread Tyrrheno-Pelasgians, in consequence of which they also became so easily Latinized. Patavium not only had its own Trojan legends, but it was by no means a

barbarous town like those of Dalmatia; it must have had a different origin, otherwise it could not have produced the most eloquent of Latin historians.

Within the territory of Venetia, we meet with a people called EUGANEI, who seem to have been regarded as the more ancient inhabitants, among whom, according to tradition, the Trojans established themselves. Two things must be distinguished in the legend of Antenor, though it cannot claim to be historically true. First, the Patavinians regarded Antenor as their κτίστης, just as the Latin towns looked upon Aeneas as the leader of a Trojan colony. Secondly, the fact of Antenor being described as a leader of the Heneti, is a mere play upon words originating in the resemblance of the names. In Venetia assuredly nothing was known about the Heneti, a people in Paphlagonia. But, however this may be,—

PATAVIUM was a very ancient and large town, and it is strange that it appears as such in Roman history all at once. It is mentioned as early as the fifth century, during the expedition of the Spartan Cleonymus; it is also spoken of at the time of Caesar and of the triumvirs. But Strabo is the first who describes Patavium as a large town, and in such a manner as to make it evident that it was an ancient place. He says that, next to Rome, it was the wealthiest city of Italy, that Patavium alone had 500 Roman equites, each of whom, as is well-known, must have possessed at least 100,000 denarii: this gives us some idea of the enormous amount of local wealth. In the time of Augustus, it was a large commercial and manufacturing place; the whole district is in fact very industrial, and its colony, Venice, besides its commerce, is also celebrated for its great industry. Patavium is always said to have been destroyed by Attila: when he advanced as far as the Po, a number of inhabitants of Patavium and other towns are said to have taken refuge in the islands of the Venetian lagoons, and to have protected themselves there. I do indeed believe, that the tempest of the Huns passed over all those towns, and

that the destruction was fearful; but I cannot believe that Padua perished. It never ceased to be a town, and was an important place during the Gothic and Lombard periods, and throughout the middle ages.

Nor can the foundation of the new city in the lagoons (Venice) have been occasioned by that sudden invasion of the Huns; the place must have been inhabited to some extent even before. This lay in the nature of circumstances. Sailors, and other people of the same kind, sought refuge in a place where they were beyond the reach of the barbarians. They went there not only on account of the Huns, but of all barbarian immigrants, for there they were safe against ill-treatment and other horrors, and land was not the thing they wanted. When Theodoric reigned in Italy, they were his faithful subjects; and they were afterwards under the dominion of the Eastern empire. The discussions which were in vogue during the seventeenth century, as to whether Venice could trace its liberties to the Roman times, were silly and quite useless. There are what are called Fasti of the Venetian consuls, but they are altogether apocryphal, a forgery of the Lombard period; they contain only late Lombard names, and do not appear to be authentic until the middle of the seventh century.

AQUILEIA, the extreme town of Italy, was a Roman colony planted for the purpose of securing Venetia, of offering resistance to the Noricans and extending the Roman dominion against them, of protecting the Roman supremacy in the Adriatic, and of keeping up the communication by land with Istria. The town, favoured by its situation, gradually increased, and became an emporium for the commerce with the northern countries, no doubt, even with the interior of Germany, to which the products of the south, wine, oil, and the like were exported. It cannot be said with certainty whether Aquileia was also a military colony. Under the emperors, it was one of the largest cities, and was carefully fortified as a place of arms for all Italy against the northern nations and the Getae.

Italy extended in the north as far as Istria; but a part of Istria, as far as Pola, was united in the division of Augustus with Italy; this was founded upon the correct view that, according to the course of the mountains, the frontier was formed by the highest ridge of the Julian Alps and their whole continuation down to the southern point of Istria. In this manner Istria was divided into two parts.

LIGURIA.

The part of the continent of Italy which remains to be considered, was probably not regarded by Polybius as belonging to Italy, or at least only partially. Liguria, in the widest sense, extended as far as Gaul, nay, as far as the frontier of Spain; but Italian Liguria, in the sense in which Augustus made it a part of Italy (not in the later sense in which it signified the territory of Milan), comprised the Genoese Alps, the continuation of the Alps forming the southern-most part of Piedmont, and the hilly country about Turin, with Alessandria, and a part of the territory of Montferrat. The Genoese Alps, that is, the range of the Alpes Maritimae as far as Briançon and mount Cénis, are among the highest and wildest parts of the Alps, while the more northern slopes of the mountains as far as the Po and the Ticinus belong to the most splendid and fertile parts of northern Italy. It is not a plain, like the territory of Milan and the country on the lower Po, which is evidently, like Egypt, an ancient bay of the sea, filled up in the course of time; but it is a hilly country. Its population in ancient times was altogether Ligurian, and the Salassi, in the valley of Aosta, are the only tribe, mentioned in after times, regarding which it is uncertain whether they were Ligurians or Celts; the Taurini were, in my opinion, Ligurians.

Although the language is changed in modern times, still the fact of French being spoken by the inhabitants of the valley of Aosta, and not Italian, is of some significance in connection with their origin: they have changed their language in a manner analogous to their origin. There is little resemblance between the French and the ancient Celtic, there being only some analogy in grammar, but not in words; in the south of France, on the other hand, as far as it was once inhabited by Aquitanians, Iberians, and Ligurians, the people speak Provençal, while the north of France, which was once inhabited by Celts, has a different dialect. This Romano-French, which has grown on Celtic ground, extends all over Savoy as far as Aosta, and shows that the country was originally inhabited by Celts. The Alpine tribes in those parts were not completely subdued until the time of Augustus. During the period of the decline of the Etruscans, the Ligurians spread far into the interior of Tuscany; and soon after the Hannibalian war, the Romans came in collision with them, not because they had offended the Romans, but the latter only wanted to gain a passage through their country to Spain. I have already observed that physically we can distinguish the countries once inhabited by Etruscans and Ligurians, and a greater contrast can scarcely exist. In Etruria the powerful cities ruled as sovereigns over all the neighbouring places and extensive territories; the Ligurians, on the other hand, were absolutely democratic, and had scarcely any towns. A port town like Genoa was a small place, but otherwise they lived in villages on the hills and in the valleys; the equality subsisting among them has no parallel anywhere except in modern Europe. They had no slaves; all were thoroughly free, and the Ligurian, working in the sweat of his brow, performed as a free labourer the services which were elsewhere the work of slaves. This difference in character is clearly manifested in the kind of resistance offered to the Romans by the Etruscans and by the Ligurians. For the same reason Charlemagne found it infinitely

more difficult to subdue the Saxons and Frisians, for they were free people, and although there were some serfs among them, yet freedom had never been really crushed. The Turingians, on the other hond, who ruled over extensive territories, in which the ancient inhabitants had become serfs, were conquered at a blow; so also the Alemanni, who possessed a large country extending as far as the lower Rhine: they had no basis. As they ruled over serfs, the greater part of the population was foreign and hostile to them. On the other hand, it took centuries to subdue the Obotritae, and Slavonians, who defended their own independence. Such, also, was the case of the Ligurians: they consisted of a large number of small tribes, which unfortunately defended themselves each separately. If they had kept together, they would have been invincible, for each of them held out with the most determined perseverance. Their misfortune makes one's heart ache: they were crushed by the Romans one by one, just as a strong wall is demolished piece by piece. The conquerors were obliged to transplant them into foreign countries; and one of their tribes is said by Pliny to have been transplanted thirty times, in order to break up all connection among them. Many thousands of them were led into southern Italy, and settled in the modern kingdom of Naples, where their language was not understood, and where they themselves were unwelcome neighbours. The extraordinary industry of the Ligurians in agriculture and navigation, their frugality, and in short, all that we know of them reflects great honour upon them. We cannot, therefore, look upon their destruction with less sadness than upon that of Numantia. Little can be said about the geography of this people.

GENUA is situated on one of those spots which will always be the site of a great commercial town, on acccount of the excellent harbour which nature herself has made. Its situation is of that fortunate kind that it cannot become unfavourable even in the course of time, like so many harbours which have become useless during the middle

ages by the accumulation of sand or mud. After the Punic war, Genua was destroyed, but was restored soon after; and there can be no doubt that even in antiquity it was a respectable town.

AUGUSTA TAURINORUM, a military colony of Augustus, was likewise a considerable town, but not to be compared with what it came to be at a later period. In comparison with the modern city of Turin, it was no doubt always a small place. On the whole, you must not conceive such military colonies to have been very large; the ancient Roman towns were much smaller than those of modern times; we generally imagine them to have been larger on account of the importance they have in history; but on an average they were not larger than, for example, Bonn. A place of the extent of Cologne, would have been a very considerable town in the time of the Romans. After the decline of Rome under the emperors, Italy had rather a numerous population, but in the age of Cicero and Augustus, as I have already remarked, it was certainly far more thinly peopled than at present. The population of the modern kingdom of Naples, north of the Faro, is reported to be 6,000,000, while under Charles V. it is said to have amounted to only 600,000. It is, indeed, said that, under Charles V., families were counted and not persons; but admitting that the number of persons was 2,000,000, which is the highest that can be made out, still it is an undoubted fact, that in less than three centuries the population has become more than trebled. I do not believe that, in the reign of Augustus, the population was larger than under Charles V. The astonishment with which Polybius and others mention the fact, that previously to the Hannibalian war, Italy as far as the Cisalpine frontier had 700,000 men capable of bearing arms, is too decisive to allow us to suppose that the country was thickly peopled. Italy clearly reminds us of the condition of Germany after the Thirty Years' war, of which we have descriptions in books of travel; and that state of Italy, as we see from Lucan, continued

until a late period. I have read a description of Germany by an Italian who travelled in the country thirty years after the war, and who saw the villages and buildings everywhere in ruins, and even the towns were full of heaps of ruins and decaying houses.

The valley of Aosta, the country of the Salassians, is remarkable for its gold-dust and gold-washings in the river Doria. Gold still exists there, but little, for such veins often are entirely drained.

SICILIA.

In passing on to the islands, I shall first speak of Sicily, the queen of the islands in the Mediterranean. It derives, like Italy and most other countries, its name from its inhabitants, and Sicilia is the country of the Siculi. I have already said that Itali and Siculi are the same name in different dialects, and that accordingly both denote the same people. The general tradition of antiquity is, that the Siculi migrated from Italy into the island, and pushed the Sicani, its previous inhabitants, into the western and southern parts. Those who go back to the mythical ages, represent the island in the most ancient times as inhabited by Gigantes, Cyclopes, and Laestrygones. It is a widely-spread opinion among the ancients, that the Sicani belonged to the race of the Iberians. The Sicani called themselves Autochthons, while, according to others, they had come from Iberia, having been displaced by Ligurians; but such an emigration, so far across the sea and by so many intermediate countries as the Balearian islands and Sardinia, or, if you please, along the coast of Africa, is incredible in the case of a people like the Iberians, who never were great navigators. I believe that, in this account, we can keep

only to this one point, that, according to the conviction of those who most thoroughly understand the circumstances, the Sicani belonged to the Iberian race, even if we admit that the tradition about their emigration is without foundation; and this is very possible. It is equally possible that the story about the emigration of the Siculi from Italy is without foundation; at least our authorities for it are not authentic. Another question is, as to whether the Sicani and Siculi were everywhere different people; the testimonies of the ancients must, of course, be of the greatest weight to us in this matter. I am not one of those who build history upon the mere names of nations, and am, therefore, not much inclined to lay great stress upon the resemblance of the two names; but Virgil uses Sicani and Siculi as synonymous, and this leads us to infer that he probably had more ancient authors before him, who had done the same. It is true also, that such a change of form is not unprecedented, for *Aequus, Aequanus, Aequulus, Aequicus*, and *Aequiculus*, are only derivatives from the same basis; and in like manner we might regard *Sicanus* and *Siculus* as simple derivatives of the stem *Sicus*. I should believe this to be quite correct, were it not that the ancients speak so positively of the Iberian origin of the Sicani. I should, in fact, reject this origin, were it not certain that Iberians existed in Corsica, Sardinia, and the Balearian islands, and in ancient times, when the Celts dwelt as far as the Sierra Morena, probably even on the coast of Africa. The Basque language is foreign to all European languages known to us; it belongs, as it were, to a different part of the world. But however this may be, the two nations in Sicily were different from each other, though we cannot say whether the difference was one of race or of a less striking nature. The Siculi inhabited the north-eastern part of the island, and the Sicani the southern and western.

At the time when the Phoenicians were in possession of the most important islands of the Aegean, as Thasos and Cythera, and had settlements in most of the Cyclades; they

also occupied strong points on the coast of Sicily; they were generally small places in little islands, headlands and the like, not being intended as agricultural settlements, but as factories. But they disappeared in consequence of the Greek colonies, which commenced at an early period, and according to the traditions from annals of which Thucydides probably made indirect use through Antiochus, soon after the beginning of the Olympiads. The colonies came from two of the Greek tribes, the Dorians and Chalcidians. In Italy, there was, properly speaking, only one Doric city that was really great, whereas in Sicily Doric cities preponderated both in number and greatness, witness Syracuse, which Timaeus calls the largest Greek city, Agrigentum, which was but little inferior to Syracuse, Gela, Selinus, and Camarina. Zancle (afterwards Messana), Naxos, Leontini, Catana, and Himera, on the north coast, were of Chalcidian origin. All the towns on the north-east, on a line from Syracuse to Palermo, were Chalcidian, and those on the south-west of it were Dorian. In speaking of the towns of Sicily, I shall make some deviation from the general rule I have hitherto followed, and enumerate them not in their natural succession, but according to their magnitude.

Sicily, like most other countries which are surrounded by the sea on two sides, presents the physical character of two different countries. In Andalusia and Algarvia, the character of the animal and vegetable world up to the mountains is African; and, in like manner, the southern part of Sicily is completely African, and the palm-tree grows there as beautifully as in Tunis and Tripoli; but the country north of cape Heraeum is quite different.

If we except the south-western coast and the district about Leontini, Sicily is altogether a mountainous country. Mount Aetna is the real central knot of the island, and the highest mountains proceed from it in a north-eastern direction as far as cape Pelorus just opposite to Italy. The Heraean range likewise proceeds from Aetna in a western direction, while another chain extends southwards. This

This last range is considerably lower than the others, but still high enough to form the water-shed between the eastern and western coast. In the part between Palermo and Messina, the mountains approach very close to the coast, so that often two places situated on the coast are not connected by a road, just as is the case in many parts of Liguria. Hence, during the wars of the Romans, we never find that the northern coast formed their scene of operation, which it is in all the wars on the south coast, for in this latter part there are roads, and armies can move. But on the northern coast there never was any communication either in the Punic wars or in those of the middle ages and modern times. It is of importance to know this in order to understand the history of the first Punic war.

AETNA is the highest mountain both of Italy and Sicily; it had only very few eruptions in antiquity, but they were sometimes of a violence which has never been equalled in modern times. According to Thucydides, the third eruption, after the settlement of the Greeks in Sicily, occurred in his own days, in the time of the Peloponnesian war. We need not, however, scrupulously insist on this number, for it is possible that all the eruptions were not recorded, and that there had been some at a time when no annals were yet kept. The eruptions of which we know, belong to Olympiads 70, 82,[1] and Olymp. 88, 3, or the sixth year of the Peloponnesian war. The greatest subsequent eruption in ancient times occurred after the death of Caesar. A still more terrible one is recorded by the earliest Byzantine writers of the age of the Greek emperor Anastasius or Zeno. During the eruption in the age of Caesar, the ashes are said to have been thrown as far as Peloponnesus and Africa, which is probably no exaggeration; but it seems scarcely

[1] These two dates occur in some MSS., but can scarcely be correct; the earlier eruption mentioned by Thucydides belongs to Olymp. 75, 2; and it seems impossible to ascertain the date of the first. Comp. Ullrich, *Beiträge zur Erklär. des Thukydides*, p. 92, foll.—ED.

possible that, in the reign of Anastasius, the ashes should have been carried as far as Constantinople, though it certainly is very difficult positively to assert anything about these powers of nature.

ERYX (monte S. Giuliano), situated in an isolated position on the western promontory, is a mountain of great historical interest. It is high, but a tame mountain, and is celebrated for its temple of Venus Erycina; but it has been immortalised in history by the defence of Hamilcar Barcas, who was blockaded there by the Romans for years, and maintained himself in spite of all difficulties: that defence is one of the greatest events in military history.

Whether Sicily derived the name *Trinacria* from its three promontories, which seems to us very probable, or whether this is only apparent, and the name arose from a Siculian town of a similar name (Trinacia or Thrinacia), independently of the form of the island, is one of those questions, concerning which it is best to confess that they cannot be satisfactorily answered.

SYRACUSAE, at first probably SYRACUSA, was the greatest Greek city in Sicily. The plural form of the name probably did not come into use until the time when several towns were united in one great city; afterwards, during the decline of the language, it was again called Syracusa. There exists an abridgment of six books (from 21 to 26) of Diodorus Siculus, which was no doubt made in Sicily itself, but at a late period, for it already contains several modern Greek expressions, and among others, also the form Syracusa. Those of the Byzantine writers who did not want to write learnedly, likewise have the singular. It is well known that Syracuse was a Corinthian colony led out by the Bacchiad Archias; the first settlement was formed in the island of Ortygia (to which the modern Siragcssa also is confined), for the sake of safety against the attacks of the inhabitants of the interior. It commenced its career as a commercial place; and this first colony was small like all

the other Greek settlements, as, for example, Cyrene. The island in the Doric dialect was called *νᾶσος*, and the Romans also retained this name (*Nasos*), as we know from Cicero's Verrine orations. A suburb of the name of *Achradina* (from *ἀχράς*, the wild pear-tree) arose on the main land opposite the island. This suburb, which increased considerably, is the Syracuse of the middle period, that is, under the first Gelo and the first Hiero, until the time of the Peloponnesian war. Nasos then became the Acra, but Achradina alone was fortified. By the side of this latter, again two large suburbs arose, *Neapolis* and *Tycha;* they seem to have commenced at two different gates, and perhaps ran parallel to each other, but were separated by a considerable intervening space. They, too, became important towns, so that Syracuse was a tetrapolis. The last two of these places which had not been fortified at all, or only feebly, were surrounded by Dionysius with a wall which he constructed at a distance of about three miles from the island. Above Syracuse there runs a range of hills, and you may easily understand its situation, by comparing it with the neighbourhood of Bonn, the plain extending between the Vorgebirge and the Rhine: the city must be conceived to be situated in the plain upon the Rhine, whence it gradually extends towards the Vorgebirge. These hills, which, just like our Vorgebirge, bound the plain stretching to the sea, were called *Epipolae*. They were from early times surmounted by forts, the object of which was to protect the district in the petty wars with the Siculians; during the Athenian war also they were very dangerous on account of the great enlargement of the city. Dionysius then fortified the city by building two mighty walls up the heights, so as to enclose those forts which now became citadels. The whole of the intermediate space between the walls, however, must not be imagined to have been covered with buildings, for between Neapolis and Tycha there were extensive tracts which can never have been built upon; the quarries also

could not be built over, as is clear from the whole surface of the ground. But the circumference of the city was enormous.

The misfortunes of Syracuse are very painful: it was visited by such a succession of devastations that we can hardly understand how it could maintain itself: it must have possessed an unusual degree of vital power. I believe that its happiest period was the reign of the last Hiero, though the population may at that time already have been much smaller than it had been in the earlier prosperous periods. In the Hannibalian war, when the city was taken by the Romans, Neapolis and Tycha were completely destroyed, and the alleged mildness of Marcellus was of no avail, for the work of destruction was completed with barbarous fury. At the capture of Achradina, Marcellus ordered to spare the lives of the inhabitants, and not to carry away a free-born Syracusan into slavery. This is always praised as an act of great humanity; but a new fragment in the excerpts from Diodorus shows that this apparently humane order did not prevent the complete pillage of the city: the Syracusans were robbed of everything, and freedom alone was granted to them. But this gift rendered their condition worse even than that of slaves, who received at least some food from their masters, while the free men died of hunger, no person supplying them with anything. Thus it happened that many a free man gave himself out to be a slave in order to find a purchaser and food. This is probably the most fearful occurrence in all ancient history. After that time there existed in Neapolis and Tycha only a few isolated buildings and temples, and the population disappeared; even in Achradina only very few inhabitants appear to have remained, for in Cicero's time the real population was again confined to the island of Nasos; the same appears to have been the condition of the city under the emperors, and at present it is still the same. Under Augustus a Roman colony was established there; still, however, the whole island of Sicily was so essentially Greek, that under the emperors it was always regarded as a part of

Greece. Even at the time of the Norman conquest, in the eleventh century of our era, Greek and Arabic were the only languages spoken there.

Although the Syracusans are not among those Greeks who excite our sympathy for them in the highest degree, yet their history is one of the most melancholy in ancient times. The whole of Greek history is very saddening in its course, but none more so than that of Syracuse, and if we seriously contemplate it, it is heartrending. The Syracusans throughout show a lawlessness which rendered them incapable of governing themselves; their only salvation was a mild usurper, as, for example, the last Hiero; he was a mild and kindly man, although even he did things which make us shudder; but this was natural in the case of Greek usurpers. The history of Syracuse begins with an aristocratic form of government, the first settlers ruling over a considerable territory, and the ancient inhabitants having become serfs (*κιλλικύριοι*). Servitude afterwards disappears, and a demos is formed, which is increased by new settlers from all parts of Greece, and has to struggle with the lords of the soil (*γάμοροι*). Gelo, one of these lords, put himself at the head of the demos, and for the sake of appearances established a democracy, but set himself up as tyrant. Under Hiero, Syracuse was extremely prosperous; with him the tyrannis ceased and democracy was restored, but was found wanting as soon as it was put to the test, and a struggle gradually arose between the wealthy few and the multitude. During this struggle there arose Dionysius I., an ambitious man, not a benefactor of the people, though he was useful in several respects, for the people could not do without a ruler. He was succeeded by his unworthy son, quite a detestable person; it was now impossible to live without a usurper, but it was equally impossible to endure him. The distressing condition became worse in consequence of the unsuccessful undertaking of Dion, respecting whom Plato was so singularly mistaken, and whom he regarded in the light of his own ideal of what a

man should be. Timoleon, a really great man, expelled Dionysius by force, and restored happiness and prosperity to the city for a period of twenty years. He ruled solely by his personal authority, and the people, for once, were grateful to him. After his death, fresh divisions arose, and Agathocles, a bold but oriental miscreant of unprincipled impudence, usurped the supreme power. Under his dominion of Syracuse became great and brilliant, but not prosperous: it was fearfully ill used; it became a den of robbers, and mercenaries of every description deluged the city with torrents of blood. Long protracted, and devastating internal wars then followed, after which came the more than fifty years' reign of Hiero, during which Syracuse was confined to a small territory. It often ruled over the whole island; but the state of things was ever changing.

The population of Syracuse is estimated at 1,200,000 souls; and this number is adopted in a great many books, but it is quite inconceivable. The population of all Sicily at present amounts to from 1,600,000 to 1,700,000, and seventy or eighty years ago it was only 1,200,000. How then is it possible, that Syracuse alone should have had such a population of free men? Diodorus indeed speaks of thirty myriads, but they must be understood as the numbers in the Roman census, that is, as comprising not only the citizens of Syracuse, but including all the inhabitants of the towns which stood to Syracuse in the relation of isopolity. Hence we may assume that Syracuse itself, at the time of its highest prosperity, contained within its walls at the most 200,000 inhabitants, including both free men and slaves, and I should be surprised to find that it actually did amount to so much. You remember that Thebes, when it was destroyed by Alexander, contained only 30,000 persons of every age, rank, and sex. The statements about the population in antiquity are monstrously exaggerated; the numbers are not always fictitious, but are founded upon misunderstandings.

AGRIGENTUM (*Ἀκράγας*, according to the common deri-

vation of such names, where ς is changed into *ntum*) was the second large city in Sicily. Plans of it are found in books of travel, and in Graevius' Thesaurus; but nothing can be more erroneous than they are, for towns in the neighbourhood are represented as parts of Agrigentum, which they never were. It was a Rhodian colony, and was inferior in greatness to Syracuse alone. The population is said to have amounted to 200,000 souls; but the case is quite similar to that of Syracuse, as is clear from another statement, which mentions only 20,000. Both uumbers may be correct, if we take the 20,000 as that of the real citizens, and the 200,000 as comprising all the isopolites of Agrigentum. But notwithstanding all this, the population of Sicily in ancient times was far larger than it is at present; its numbers in the towns of the island change with incredible rapidity. In the middle ages, Messina had 140,000 inhabitants; at the end of the seventeenth century, the ill-usage of the Spaniards reduced them to somewhat less than 100,000, and the plague brought them down to 90,000; afterwards, by the systematic oppression, the object of which was to crush Messina and to raise Palermo, they were reduced to 40,000; and before the earthquake their number amounted only to 25,000; at present it is said to be 70,000. Such is the vitality in those southern countries, and such are the changes in their population. In the north, too, fluctuations occur, but not to the same extent as in the south, where people have so few wants, and many can live in the open air without a cover for their heads until some favourable opportunity occurs. Immense ruins of Agrigentum still exist: it was situated on a hill and was visible from the sea at a great distance, whence Virgil says, *Arduus hic Acragas ostendit maxima longe moenia.* I have already directed your attention to the fact that *moenia* signifies "large buildings in a city;" the walls of Agrigentum had nothing striking, and parts of them ran in the valley, so that Virgil cannot have alluded to them. The buildings of the city were not yet quite completed when

they were destroyed in the Carthaginian war; they were much larger than those at Syracuse or any other of the Greek towns of Sicily. Before the war in Olymp. 93, Agrigentum was the wealthiest city in the island; but the stories of the riches of particular citizens, as, for example, of Gellias, which Diodorus relates after Timaeus, are quite fabulous, for Timaeus was credulous. In Olymp. 93, Agrigentum was taken and completely destroyed by the Carthaginians; the town was defended in the most unfortunate manner, or not defended at all: the Greek generals during that war were so wretched and senseless, that the Agrigentines had enough to do in trying to save themselves, leaving their city with all its treasures a prey to the enemy. It was afterwards restored indeed, but the new town was only a shadow of what it had been before. In consequence of the treaties by which Selinus was ceded to the Carthaginians, Agrigentum was re-united with the Greek part of Sicily, of which Syracuse, under Dionysius and Timoleon, was the capital. Afterwards the character of the wars between the Greeks and Carthaginians was no longer as destructive as it had been before, for Carthage was satisfied with subduing and ruling over the Greek towns. After the reign of Agathocles, Agrigentum again fell into the hands of the Carthaginians. In the first Punic war, it was taken by the Romans, and on that occasion one part of its inhabitants made their escape, while others perished or were sold as slaves. Towards the end of the Punic war, it was again implicated in an insurrection against the Romans, in consequence of which it became so desolate that the Romans, to prevent the complete extinction of the place, established there colonists from other Sicilian towns. Agrigentum is indeed mentioned in Cicero's Verrine orations, but it is clear that it was quite an insignificant town; under the Roman emperors it remained in the same condition, and may have been of little more importance than the modern Girgenti. The gigantic ruins of the ancient city are situated on the plateau of the hill: the severest blow it ever

received was that in Olymp. 93, and subsequent earthquakes also contributed to its destruction.

SELINUS, nearer the western promontory, was likewise a Dorian settlement. It was an extensive, wealthy, and important town at the time when the Carthaginians, after the unsuccessful attempt under Gelo, who confined them to their three factories, Motye, Panormus, and Soloeis, were expelled from all other parts of the island. But during the unfortunate Carthaginian war, by means of which Dionysius raised himself, it was the first town that was captured and destroyed. After that time, it is indeed still mentioned, and in fact never ceased to exist, but was never again incorporated with the Greek portion of Sicily. It remained subject to Carthage, as long as she had any possessions in the island, and then came into the hands of the Romans, but never acquired any importance.

GELA, likewise an ancient Dorian settlement, was abandoned by its Greek inhabitants during the Carthaginian war, and destroyed by the Carthaginians. Even before this, the place had several times changed its population: in the time of Gelo it was restored, but after the repeated destructions by its enemies, it recovered only partially. It received its death-blow shortly after the time of Agathocles, when Phintias, the tyrant of Agrigentum, transplanted its inhabitants to the town of Phintias, founded by himself.

CAMARINA experienced the same fate as Gela.

On the southern coast there existed, at different times, several Doric towns, as *Heraclea* in the territory of Agrigentum, *Acrae*, and *Casmenae*, but they are of no importance.

NAXOS, the most ancient among the Chalcidian or Ionian settlements, was situated between mount Aetna and the Sicilian straits; it was in fact the earliest Greek colony in Sicily. It is doubtful whether Naxos was destroyed by Gelo or Hiero. During the great period of Sicilian history its name is not mentioned.

ZANCLE, afterwards MESSENE or MESSANA; the cause of this change of name is obscure. The story about Gorgus,

the son of Aristomenes, and Manticlus, is untenable and chronologically impossible. Still, however, there must have been a mixture of Messenians which gave rise to the name. Samians, who had fled from their own country, treacherously took possession of the town in which they had been hospitably received. More than two hundred years later, their descendants were punished for the deed by the Campanian mercenaries of Agathocles, who butchered the inhabitants who had allowed them a passage through their town. After this time the place was always called Messana, while the inhabitants bore the name of Mamertines, which was the general designation for Oscan mercenaries. These Mamertines retained their Italian character, without becoming hellenised in any way; and even as late as the time of Verres we find them mentioned with their Oscan names, the praenomen and the nomen gentilicium. Their coins, however, have inscriptions in Greek characters, and I have no doubt that in the course of time the Mamertines also became hellenised. The Roman element in the western countries was powerful in regard to the Celts, Iberians and others; but it was unable to cope with the Greeks, against whom the Romans did not gain one inch; no Greek town ever became Latinised, unless all its inhabitants perished. Among non-Greek nations, such as the Pannonians, Dardanians, and the other tribes in those countries, the Latin language became predominant within an extremely short period. The name Mamertines remained in use until the time of the Roman emperors, but it then disappears, and the name Messana is again generally employed.

CATANA, likewise a considerable Chalcidian town, was situated near the river Simaethus, at the foot of mount Aetna. Hiero I. carried away the inhabitants, and founded a new town; but after his death everything was restored. After the time of the Athenian expedition, Catana was nearly always under the influence of Syracuse.

TAUROMENIUM, in the neighbourhood of Naxos between mount Aetna and Messana, was founded in the time of

Timoleon. It was situated on mount Tauros, which was quite inaccessible. The derivation of its name *ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ταύρου μονῆς* is strange. With the exception of Phintias, it was the youngest of the Greek towns in Sicily. These late colonies are essentially different from the earlier ones: they had no oecistae and no institutions according to the ancient forms, but being the result of circumstances they did not observe the traditionary formalities. Tauromenium was very strong by its situation; and, in consequence of the nature of its locality, its ruins are more perfectly preserved than those of any other Greek city in Sicily. The splendid theatre was cut in a semicircle into the rock, and still exists in its ancient beauty. In the history of literature, Tauromenium is celebrated as the birth-place of the historian Timaeus, who, as we have learned only recently, spent the greater part of his long life of ninety years in exile at Athens, where in all probability he also died. The fifty years of his exile embrace the whole reign of Agathocles.

LEONTINI was situated at some distance from the coast. It is a mistake in translations and other books to call this town Leontium, a name which does not occur anywhere. Its original name must have been *Λεοῦς*, although this form is not found in the extant monuments either. As Messana was called Mamertini, from its Oscan inhabitants, so also in the case of Leontini, the name of the people was used as the name of the town. It was the chief place in the most fertile corn district of Sicily, and the *campi Leontini* are often mentioned on this account. The town was destroyed by the Syracusans at least three times, but always recovered itself.

HIMERA, on the north coast, was a colony of Chalcidians mixed with Dorians, but in such a manner that the *νόμιμα Χαλκιδικὰ* prevailed. In Olymp. 93, it was destroyed by the Carthaginians. The town itself was never restored, but around some hot springs in the neighbourhood (*θερμὰ Ἱμεραῖα*) a small town of the name of *Therma*, or *Thermae*, arose, whose inhabitants were called *Thermitani*. This

town is remarkable as the birth-place of Agathocles, who, though a monster, is yet an important person in history. Himera was one of the genuine ancient Greek colonies.

On the north coast between Himera and Messana, there were several Greek towns of uncertain origin, which were probably founded by neighbouring cities, and were afterwards inhabited by Greeks of all kinds. Places of this kind are *Cephaloedion, Mylae*, and *Calacte;* they are not of great importance, and I cannot here enter into any detail about them.

In the time of Thucydides there existed three Punic towns on the north-west coast of Sicily, viz., *Soloeis*, *Motye*, and *Panormus*. Motye was the principal place among them, and stood to Carthage in the same relation as Utica, Leptis, and others. About thirty years before the passage of Xerxes into Europe, at the time of the expulsion of Tarquin, the Carthaginians were already in possession of a province in Sicily; they then concluded a treaty with Rome, which has been preserved by Polybius. Ancient Greek history gives us no information about this, but rather makes it appear as if their attempt in the time of Gelo to establish themselves in Sicily had been the first; but the treaty with Rome is indubitable. The statement that the victory of Salamis, and that of Gelo over the Carthaginians at Himera, took place on the same day, a coincidence on which Herodotus lays great stress, is likewise untenable, for it is opposed to the account which we have in the Parian marbles from Timaeus. The origin of the fiction evidently lies in the desire to have a parallel. Gelo's victory must be dated seven or nine years later than the time to which it is assigned by Diodorus. After that defeat, the Carthaginians always maintained themselves on the north-western coast, where no Greek town existed. When, in the course of time, the power of the Carthaginians had greatly increased, and when they displayed a love of conquest, the neighbouring town of Egesta threw itself into their arms. The Greeks in Sicily were, on the one hand, extremely careless, and

on the other fool-hardy in giving provocation, and these circumstances gave rise to the unfortunate war with Carthage. In the second war with Dionysius, Motye, which until then, had been the chief place of the Carthaginians, was destroyed. They now built a new town, Olymp. 100, of the name of *Lilybaeum*: when it was taken by the Romans, it had existed about 150 years. It was the seat of the Carthaginian government, a regular Carthaginian eparchy being established in those parts, which is always called ἡ Φοινικικὴ ἐπαρχία. Bochart's etymologies, from the Semitic languages, are often quite without foundation, but he explains the name Lilybaeum quite correctly as לִלְבִי, that is, opposite to Libya. *Soloeis* was an unimportant place.

PANORMUS became a great town under the dominion of the Carthaginians. It is strange that both Soloeis and Panormus are Greek names; the money coined in the latter place at the time of the Carthaginian dominion in Sicily, is likewise Greek, from which we must infer that Panormus was not a Punic colony like Lilybaeum. The natural advantages of its situation are very great: it has an excellent harbour, as even its name intimates, and its site is in a beautiful fertile plain on the coast, above which mount Hercte rises at the entrance of the harbour. This mountain was a very important post during the first Punic war.

LILYBAEUM remained an important place even under the Romans, though its name is afterwards but rarely mentioned. The Romans, for financial purposes, divided Sicily into two provinces, viz., Syracuse and Lilybaeum; they were governed by one praetor, but had different financial administrations, because the systems of taxation were different in the two parts. So long as Carthage existed, the Romans kept up Lilybaeum as a place of arms and a military port; but the place afterwards lost this importance, because its harbour was gradually filled with sand. It is at present known only for its excellent vineyards.

DREPANA, the modern Trapani, near Lilybaeum, was another strongly fortified port town of the Carthaginians,

and is still of importance. All these places act a conspicuous part in the first Punic war.

EGESTA, or SEGESTA, was situated in the neighbourhood of Drepana. Thucydides says that its inhabitants were Trojans; and the unanimous voice of antiquity calls the Egestans and the Elymi, there and about mount Eryx, Trojans. I have explained my opinion on this point in my Roman History, and shewn that Trojans here means Tyrrhenians or Pelasgians, like those occupying the coasts of Italy and Sardinia. The name Trojans, therefore, seems to have been a general Pelasgian name, which was commonly applied to the Mysian Trojans, because they were the most important, just as the name Hellenes was commonly given to the people of Argos. All these nations were connected by religion and their common sanctuary of Samothrace, the Trojan character of which is undeniable. The Segestans are called by the Greeks barbarians, and they were certainly non-Greeks; but when we consider the ruins of their temples, which are not only grand but splendid, and are in no way inferior to the most beautiful Greek edifices; and when we see their coins, which equal the finest specimens made in Greece, we must confess that the word "barbarian" cannot be understood here in the same sense in which it is applied to Thracians, Getae, and Macedonians, who were not even able correctly to imitate the formation of Greek words. Afterwards, Segesta, like all the rest of the island, became completely hellenised; Cicero always calls the Siculi Greeks, and the names of the Segestans, wherever they occur in history, are Greek. Segesta was an unfortunate place, for it was the occasion of the deplorable expedition of the Athenians to Sicily, of which we can only lament the final issue. It would have been fortunate, if the Athenians had been able to carry it out with energy, for the fate of Greece would have taken a different direction. The Segestans have much to answer for to Sicily, to Greece, and to all the world, for they misled the Athenians by their delusive promises. After the defeat of the Athenians, the

Chalcidian towns one by one concluded peace, and the Segestans, abandoned by every one, were obliged to throw themselves into the arms of the Carthaginians. Under their protection, the town was safe and prosperous for a period of about ninety years, until the time when the power of Agathocles reached its highest point. But when Agathocles was victorious for a time, it was taken by the sword, and treated like Magdeburg in the Thirty Years' war. Afterwards a population again assembled there; in the first Punic war Segesta is mentioned again, and submits to the Romans under an appeal to its Trojan origin.

The towns in the interior of Sicily were originally partly Siculian and partly Sicanian, though it is now impossible to draw a line of demarcation between them. In the north, about mount Aetna as far as Henna, all the towns, such as Henna, Centuripa, Agyrion, Halesa, Aluntion, and many others, were probably Siculian. The Siculians, even after the time of Gelo, formed distinct states and had their own kings. Diodorus compiled his history in a most unsystematic manner: when he is engaged with the history of a nation, and it occurs to him, that he has dwelt upon it long enough, and that he has neglected another, he all at once breaks off and begins to discuss the latter. Such is the case in his history of Sicily: he is often very minute, relating the events of a nation year after year, but then he is for a time quite silent about it. After the time of Gelo and Hiero, we find a Siculian kingdom, under a prince called Ducetius, which was very dangerous to the Siceliots.[1] Afterwards we see the Siculians broken up into many small states, some of which were hellenised at a very early period. The power of the Greek tyrants often extended very far into the interior; and those of Syracuse at times ruled almost over the whole island; during such times, Greeks settled in all parts of it. These

[1] "The *Siculi* were the natives, and the *Siceliots* the Greeks who had settled in the island. Similarly the Romans sometimes distinguished between *Siculi* and *Sicilienses*, but not by far as consistently as the Greeks, for no Greek ever confounded the two."

things are often mentioned only accidentally, as for example, in the case of Diodorus himself, who is called a Siceliot, though he belonged to a Siculian town. At that time the Siculian and Sicanian languages no longer existed and Greek was spoken everywhere.

HENNA, situated in the centre of the country, was the most important of all the Siculian towns. Henna, and not Enna, is the correct spelling, for so we find it on a very ancient Greek coin; and only later Latin ones have Enna, whereas all the good Latin MSS., such as the Codex Puteanus of Livy, as well as the inscriptions, have the H, as in *ordo populusque Hennensis;* in after-times the pronunciation was modified. I do not, however, mean to say, that if you find Enna in a poet, you must at once correct it into Henna, for such things depend upon authority; the ancients often pronounced a word with an aspiration, which we cannot accurately imitate, and which, therefore, has disappeared in Italian and other modern languages. Henna is celebrated as the central seat of the worship of Demeter and Persephone, which spread thence into Italy, and was also adopted by the Greeks. It was probably different from the worship of Demeter at Eleusis; but we cannot speak positively about this matter, and in my opinion, it is a mere waste of learning and ingenuity to institute inquiries about it.

CENTURIPA (*Centuripini, Κεντόριπα*), near the slope of mount Aetna, was the greatest town of the interior at the time of the Romans. In the age of Cicero, its citizens were the wealthiest in all Sicily. In the first Punic war, they had been enabled by circumstances, about which we have no information, to put themselves in an extremely favourable relation to the Romans; this had been done at a time when the other Siculian places had allowed themselves to be tempted to rise against Rome; and in consequence of this, Centuripa was honoured with great privileges. It derived special advantages from the extensive confiscations which were often made of whole districts. On such occasions, the

Roman equites speculated to acquire large estates, and the Centuripans undertook as farmers (*aratores*), or agricultural speculators, the cultivation of large districts; the existence of such aratores is known from Cicero's Verrine orations. Centuripa then remained the centre of Sicilian agriculture, probably until a very late period. *Agyrion* was situated in the neighbourhood of Centuripa.

I have already said in general how Sicily became a desolate country. When many towns had already been destroyed in the wars of Agathocles, the first Punic war, which lasted twenty-four years, was extremely destructive, because it was carried on at the expense of that small country; the Syracusan kingdom alone, which was in the enjoyment of order and protection, was exempted. Then followed the second Punic war, and the senseless insurrection of the Syracusans and of nearly all the inhabitants of the island. They were punished by the Romans in such a manner, that all cultivation disappeared from the greater part of the island; the towns perished and were changed into large estates; the corn-fields in the interior were changed into pastures, on which large numbers of cattle and hosts of slaves were kept, while the free population was almost entirely extirpated. Hence the insurrection of Eunus, in the year of Rome 620; a war was then carried on with great exertion for years, and was not brought to a close until several Roman armies had been defeated. Thirty years later, a second similar Servile war broke out, which, though it did not last quite as long as the first, yet completely ruined several towns: the slaves took possession of the fortified places, and annihilated the free population. As regards the period of the Roman emperors, we only know that Augustus established colonies in some places, but the rest of the island was quite desolate, there being only some large estates and stations for post horses. The Regestum of pope Gregory the Great, which contains the last accounts of Sicily before it fell into the hands of barbarians, shows the island in this wretched condition. The

Roman see possesses large estates in Sicily, and the correspondence with their stewards reveals to us the condition of the island and the nature of such estates: we see that the country was in a state of utter decay.

SARDINIA.

Sardinia fully confirms the observation regarding the identity of the physical character of countries on two sides of the same sea. There does not exist a more senseless notion than to imagine that rivers form the natural boundaries between two countries; the same physical features appear on both sides of a river: rivers are lines of communication, but mountains separate countries from one another. The Suabian and Bavarian races are separated by the range of the Vorarlberg. Sardinia, in its physical structure, belongs to Africa, if not wholly, at least its southern part as far as the mountains. This character shows itself both in the vegetation and in the animal life of the country: the *musimon,* an animal foreign to all the rest of Europe, is not found anywhere out of Africa except in Sardinia.[1] The character of the population also is African, whence Cicero, in his speech for Scaurus, says: *Afer aut Sardus sane, si ita se isti malunt nominari.* The island is not, like Sicily, traversed by lofty mountains; it is only in the northern part that the mountains reach any considerable height; the rest is only a hilly country; many parts of the coast are plains, extensive and low marshy districts, which may be termed savannahs, whence great quantities of salt are obtained there. The physical identity with Africa manifests itself also in another very important point: the opposite coasts of Sardinia and Africa are cele-

[1] According to Berghaus, *Länder-und Völkerkunde,* iii. p. 404, it is found also in Corsica, Greece, and the Greek Archipelago.—Ed.

brated for their banks of coral, while they are not found near Sicily, Spain, or the Balearian islands.[1]

According to the most ancient tradition, the inhabitants of Sardinia were Tyrrhenians, who appear in various forms and personifications, in the story about Aristaeus, in the Iolai, and in many other ways. If Tyrrhenians did exist there, they can only have been settlers on the coasts, for a part of the inhabitants, such as the *Noraces* and *Balari,* were certainly of Iberian origin, and belonged to the same race as the inhabitants of the Balearian islands. In regard to others again, it is equally certain that they were of Libyan origin, for they are stated to have resembled the Berbers in language, in bodily structure, complexion, and hair. The *Sardi Montani*, perhaps a mixture of Iberians and Libyans, were in later times confined to the mountains. These mountains, however, must not be conceived as Alps, for heights of a less lofty character were sufficient for those people to maintain themselves in them. The highlands of Scotland also do not contain any high mountains, they are only inaccessible, and yet the population has maintained itself there throughout all the changes of nations. The sea-coast was occupied at an early time by Punic colonies, which afterwards became masters of the island, with the exception of the interior, over which they exercised no other influence than that which a powerful nation on the coast always possesses over the other inhabitants. In like manner the Dutch did not rule over the interior of Ceylon, the prince of Candy being sovereign, though he was obliged to comply with the wishes of the Dutch whenever they insisted upon it. Such was the condition of Sardinia during the second Punic war, when we meet with Hampsicora and Hiostus as Sardinian princes. The Punic settlements consisted for the most part of Carthaginians mixed with Libyans, as the Carthaginians themselves were a mixed race (*Λιβυφοίνικες*), or with Greeks from Sicily and Magna Graecia. The Libyans

[1] The more correct view is given by Berghaus, *l. c.* p. 460.—Ed.

must not be conceived as negroes: in their physical features they are not very unlike Europeans, and scarcely differ at all from southern Europeans, so that the mixture could take place without any difficulty. The mixture of the Libyphoenices with the Sardinians is attested by Cicero in an interesting fragment of his speech for Scaurus. The Punic language accordingly predominated everywhere on the coast, and all the known names of the Sardinians are Punic, e. g., *Aris*, genitive *Arinis*, which is nothing else than the Hebrew Aaron; so also Caralis and others. I said before, that Sardinia, near the coast, has extensive low grounds, which are, for the most part, marshy and unhealthy: this peculiarity, (*aër gravis*), which is still the reason of the scanty population of the island, was known even to the historians of antiquity; the country was very dangerous to the Roman soldiers, many of whom died there of fevers. This we see from Tacitus' annals[1] to have been the case in the time of Tiberius, and such it continues to be at the present day; in most parts it is impossible to remove the unhealthy character of the land by cultivation.

There are still many Punic remains in Sardinia; but there also are a few Cyclopean walls, which can neither be ascribed to the Punians nor to the Sardinians of the interior, but must be Greek. They are minutely discussed in Millot's description of Sardinia, which is a bad book, but contains valuable information about those Cyclopean walls. Timaeus spoke of ruins which were referred to the Iolai, the alleged ancient Greek colonists. Most of the antiquities that have been dug out of the ground, belong to the Roman period, but some also are Punic and have Punic inscriptions. Many belong to the rude barbarians of the interior, especially certain hideous and deformed idols resembling those of the Wends and American Indians.

There were no towns in the interior of Sardinia, the mountaineers living either in villages or caves; their dress

[1] ii. 85: *si ob gravitatem coeli interissent.*

consisted, as at present, of skins of the musimon (*mastrucae Sardorum*), forming a sort of fur jackets. They were very poor mountaineers, and the only booty the Romans made there consisted of slaves. In a letter of pope Gregory the Great, in his Regestum, a people of the name of *Barbaricini* is mentioned in the interior, and this confirms the identity of the Sardinians with the Libyans, for Barbaricini is only a derivative form of Barbari, a name by which the Greeks and Romans designated more particularly the Berbers in Africa. During the Punic period there were, properly speaking, only three towns that were of any importance, viz., Caralis, Sulci, and Nora.

CARALIS, the modern Cágliari (not Cagliári, as it is commonly pronounced, for the inhabitants themselves say Cágliari), was the Carthaginian capital with an excellent harbour.

SULCI and NORA, likewise of Phoenician origin, are mentioned indeed in history, but were places of no particular importance. Considerable ruins of the Roman period are still found at Nora, and Caralis has what is called a beautiful ancient theatre. In the accounts I have seen of it, it is called so, but owing to the uncritical manner in which the subject is treated, I cannot say whether it is a real theatre or an amphitheatre.

Sardinia is still the country in which European civilisation and the change of manners resulting from it, have taken less root than in any part of Europe: those who regard civilisation as an evil, must consider Sardinia to be a paradise. In no country have witches been burnt at so recent a period, and the practice, perhaps, still prevails; the government has not yet been able to suppress the custom of taking revenge for bloodshed. The villages make war upon one another, and no one can travel with safety along the high roads, unless he purchase the protection of a party or a village, as in the East, or else he must acquire the rights of hospitality. According to the accounts we have

of the condition of the island, we may imagine it to be something like that which certain persons call the golden period of the middle ages. But with all this barbarism, the greatest immorality prevails, especially among the priests. The country is in a perfect state of anarchy, being governed according to ancient privileges, which have never been changed at all; the country population is in a state of complete dissolution. When the island has an able governor, he can keep order only by the utmost rigour, without which he can do absolutely nothing. It is deplorable that, in these circumstances, the administration of the island is not entrusted to able men, the propriety of which I have often urged. I sometimes desired natives of Sardinia to come to me that I might examine their language, which is very peculiar; you cannot say that it is Italian, it contains indeed very much Latin, but much also that is quite foreign. The Sardinian mountaineers are said to have many words in their dialect which are radically different from all other European languages. As much information has at present been collected about the Berber language, my object was to question the natives and to examine their words to see whether they were Berber or Basque. But I could not succeed, the people were too timid and did not come. I have now placed my hope upon a friend, Count Castiglione, of Milan, a great linguist, who has studied the language of the Berbers; he may perhaps be more successful. The island, from the earliest times, always made the impression of a wild and ungenial country, which, poor as it was, was severely treated by the Carthaginians, for they are said to have forbidden the cultivation of grain, in order to compel the Sardinians to import their supplies from Spain and Africa. In like manner Spain, for a long time, would not tolerate the cultivation of European grain in her American possessions, and when at length she allowed it, she forbade the planting of olives and vines.

It was the universally established opinion among the ancients, that Sardinia was the largest island, and larger than

Sicily. This opinion, though erroneous, is found in all ancient writers, and we cannot say what may have given rise to it.

CORSICA.

Whether *Corsica* and the Greek name *Κύρνος* are etymologically connected with each other, must be left undecided; I for my part believe, that the resemblance of the first syllable in the two names is only accidental. Corsica was regarded by the ancients as still more wild, uninhabitable, unhealthy, and barbarous than Sardinia; it was inhabited partly by Ligurians and partly by Iberians, and its inhabitants maintained their independence till about the time of the first Punic war, when the Carthaginians seem to have established themselves in the island, at least near its magnificent harbours. It would indeed be inconceivable, if they had overlooked a harbour like that of S. Lorenzo. It is self-evident, however, that the inhabitants of the interior remained quite independent, for even the Genoese, though they lived so much nearer the island, were never able entirely to subdue them. At present it is, properly speaking, in a state of anarchy, though it is connected with the powerful monarchy of France; what, therefore, must have been its condition under the Carthaginians, whose dominion did not last long! At an earlier time the Phocaeans had attempted to settle at Alalia (Aleria), but had not succeeded. The Romans undertook an expedition to it as early as the first Punic war; but the only result of it was, that they expelled the Carthaginians, without they themselves being able to take possession of the island. It was not till a much later period that they subdued it, but they seem to have felt that it was not worth while to spend so much money and blood for the purpose of enabling themselves to remain there.

MARIANA and ALERIA are the only two towns of Corsica deserving to be noticed; both were Roman military colonies, the former founded by Marius, and the latter by Sulla. At the time of the Roman emperors, Corsica, like several islands in the Archipelago, served as a place to which condemned persons were exiled, *relegatio in insulam.*

Corsica is altogether a mountainous island, with the exception of a narrow tract of coast, which forms unhealthy lowlands with small rivers. The mountains are not high, and form one of the ramifications of the Apennines, but are very impassable and intricate.

—◆—

HISPANIA.

The name Hispania, as Bochart correctly states, is in all probability of Punic origin, derived from ספן, *Sapan, Span,* from which, an *i* being prefixed, *Ispania,* or *Hispania,* was formed. In southern as well as eastern languages, the pronunciation of an *s*, followed by a consonant, is facilitated by prefixing a vowel, whence *Scipio*, in ordinary life, is called *Iscipio.* You recollect the notion of the Greeks about the four parts of the world, according to which Hesperia was the western and Europe the northern part; in this division, Spain was a part of Hesperia. The Greeks called the people *Iberians,* the country *Iberia*, and the river *Iberus.* This name of the river must have been of native origin or have been used by the Carthaginians, for the Romans also employed it, though they called the people *Hispani* and the country *Hispania.* We do not know by what name the people called themselves; it is possible that the Basque language may throw light upon it; but in the masterly treatise on that language by Baron Humboldt, nothing is said about this point. Afterwards, and in the

Acts of the Apostles, the country was called *Spania*, and it may have borne this name generally among the Alexandrians and in the unjustly decried Hellenistic language. The Byzantine writers also call it so, unless they employ the correct name Iberia.

Spain is destined by nature, almost more than Italy, to form one compact state; no one can have a doubt about this, when looking at the three seas by which it is surrounded. Nevertheless, however, it did not become united as one whole till a late period, though this happened before the time of which we have written records; for there can be no doubt that previously it was divided into two distinct countries. On the one side, the Pyrenees formed its natural boundary towards Gaul (in the course of time, however, they were crossed, and the Iberians ruled over the country from the Garonne to the Rhone); but at an earlier period another natural boundary line was formed by the Sierra Morena, an extensive range of mountains, which, for a couple of centuries, formed the boundary between the Christian and Mahommedan parts of Spain. These same mountains, no doubt, also separated the Iberians from the Celts. The heights in the north of Spain, whence the Tagus, Durius, and Minius, flow towards the sea, and whence, on the other side, smaller rivers carry their waters towards the Ebro, were inhabited by Celts, who are also called *Celtiberians*. Other Celts bearing the name *Celtici* dwelt in Algarbia and the Portuguese Estremadura, and others again inhabited the province Entre Douro e Minho in the north of Portugal. These three Celtic nations were quite isolated in Spain. The Celtiberians were not pure Celts, but as even their name indicates, a mixture of Celts and Iberians; but the Celts in Portugal are expressly stated to have been pure Celts. These latter attracted the attention even of the ancients, especially of the excellent Posidonius, who made so many correct observations, but allowed himself in this instance to be misled. He is of opinion that the Celts had immigrated into Spain, for he reasoned thus: as the Celts

could migrate into Italy and across the Danube as far as the Dniepr, it was far less difficult for them to enter the neighbouring country of Spain. But such isolated parts of a nation cannot have arrived in a country by immigration; on the contrary, the Iberians appear extending themselves and in possession of Aquitania and Languedoc at a very early period; how then could the Celts, not being able to maintain the Pyrenees, have spread over the whole peninsula? It is probable, nay almost evident, that it was the Iberians that migrated and extended themselves, and this opinion agrees with the most ancient traditions of the Celts in Ammianus Marcellinus, according to which they were once masters of all the west of Europe, but were expelled from many parts. If we suppose that the Celts dwelt as far as the Sierra Morena, and that the Iberians, perhaps reinforced by their kinsmen from Africa, pressed them forward, this supposition would account for some Celtic ruins which are still extant, and the Celts may have capitulated in a manner similar to that described in the book of Joshua. As one part of England was occupied by Germans so completely as to destroy every trace of the ancient inhabitants, while elsewhere, as e.g., in Devonshire, the Britons, in large numbers, lived among the Germans and became mixed with them; so the Iberians expelled the ancient Celtic population, wherever the nature of the country did not protect it; but the Celts maintained themselves in the mountains between the Tagus and the Iberus, and the Iberians only subdued them, and then settled among them. In the course of time the two nations became amalgamated, and thus formed the Celtiberians, whose character, however, is essentially Iberian.

Spain may be naturally divided into four main parts. The first is Andalusia, which is formed by the Sierra Morena, which separates the valley of the Baetis (Guadalquivir) from that of the Guadiana. This part is a compact country by itself, being separated from Murcia by the heights in the east. The second part is bounded on the south

by the range of Orospeda, and in the north by that of Idubeda, which extends in an eastern direction towards the sea. These mountains separate the river basins of the Tago and Douro from that of the Ebro, and run at a right angle with the Sierra Morena. This division comprises the greater part of Valencia, Aragon, and Catalonia, that is, the whole river basin of the Ebro. The third division consists of the mountainous countries of Galicia, Asturias, and Cantabria. The fourth, lastly, consists of the river basin of the Tago. These divisions are so completely founded on the natural features of the country, that throughout the history of Spain they appear with perfect distinctness, and hence they may also be taken as a guide in ancient history.

Andalusia, the southernmost part, is almost identical with ancient *Baetica,* and, as is observed even by Strabo, is a country quite different from the rest of Spain. It has indeed many points of resemblance with Valencia, but is at the same time essentially different from it: it is in fact a country of a superior character. While Valencia is flat, and well watered, but wanting in energy, Andalusia and Granada are countries matured by the sun in the highest degree; they are scarcely European, but almost like tropical countries. The eastern division, or the country of the Iberus, if we examine its northern parts, Aragon and Catalonia, already greatly resembles a northern country. Valencia stands in the middle between them. The whole of the northern division is a mighty mountainous country; the mountains in Asturia and Biscay are very high, though they do not reach the snow line; the highest parts are in the neighbourhood of the sources of the Douro. The country of the Tago is throughout a table-land, very high at its commencement, piercingly cold and unhealthy as far as the frontier of Portugal, and almost without any mountains; at the commencement alone we have the ranges separating Old and New Castile. Between the Sierra Morena and the Douro, we have the large plain of Estremadura, which is fertile but unhealthy, and perfectly flat; the plain of Leon is scarcely

inhabitable on account of its drought and barrenness; the southern parts of Castile are productive, and the continuation of the valley into Portugal changes its character so much as to become extremely rich; it still contains large plains, but the greater part is a beautiful hilly country.

The principal rivers are the *Baetis* (Guadalquivir), *Anas* (Guadiana), *Tagus* (Tago), *Durius* (Douro), Minius (Minho), and in the east, the *Turia* (Guadalaviar) and the *Iberus* (Ebro). In antiquity, Spain was particularly celebrated for its gold and silver mines, and for the gold found in the sand of its rivers, as in that of the Tagus, which, for this reason, is called by poets *aurifer amnis*. The largest silver mines, where both silver and lead were found, existed in the territory of Carthagena in Murcia; but Asturia, too, contained veins of precious metal. Spanish wool was not particularly valued in antiquity, and it was not till the middle ages that sheep-breeding was improved in Spain.

Baetica produced abundance of grain, besides which the ancients derived from other parts of Spain a kind of hemp, called *spartus*, which was spun like hemp, and out of which ropes and cables were manufactured.

The ancients were universally of opinion that the Spaniards, exclusive of the Celtic inhabitants and the few Greeks and Punians who had settled there, consisted of two nations, the *Turdetanians* and the *other Spaniards*. This opinion originating with Artemidorus, is set forth by Strabo so confidently, that we must believe him to have had other and more weighty authorities than Artemidorus. They even speak of a difference in language. For a long time, I too entertained this opinion, because I trusted the ancients; but I have only a very vague notion of the Iberian language. W. von Humboldt is the only man in Europe who has examined those languages with a true grammatical genius, and he has declared that all the proper names from one end of Spain to the other, absolutely belong to one and the same language, and that the names of places among the Cantabri, Ilergetes, Lusitani, Turdetani, etc., must all

be traced to roots in the Cantabrian language. To this argument we must submit; nothing can be said against it: in matters of this kind, the later Greeks often went very far astray, for which reason we ought not to admit them as authorities without great caution. But, admitting that all names of places are Cantabrian, the opinion of the ancients may be based upon something else, viz., the knowledge that the nation, during its extension from the south to the northern parts, underwent various modifications, and that more especially those who dwelt in the north among the conquered people, assumed a character quite different from that of the inhabitants of Andalusia, who lived by themselves.

The Turdetanians were a people possessing a considerable degree of civilisation, for they had an alphabet of their own; and many of their inscriptions and coins with characters unknown to us are still extant. Many Spanish coins cannot be explained at all, and of many the meaning is extremely uncertain. I hope that, if the investigations are carried on judiciously, the Libyan alphabet, which is said to be like that of the Spaniards, will be discovered in the course of time, and the Libyan inscriptions will be explained. Men will then rise up like Baron von Humboldt, who will fathom the Libyan language, and then the Spanish inscriptions also will be read. In Cilicia, too, inscriptions have been found, which have not yet been read, and many more may still be discovered; but no one has as yet occupied himself with them. These investigations, however, ought to be undertaken with a sober mind, for otherwise they lead to nothing. In ancient history, we often fancy we see nothing, and yet there is much to be discovered. Lately, e. g., an Englishman travelling in Cilicia from Adana to Tarsus,[1] where a pass is cut along the sea-coast for the purpose of making a road (just as above Coblenz the rocks advance close to the river), found, as he himself told me, a large inscription on the side of the rock in characters

[1] This name is only a conjecture of mine; one M.S. has *Colero*. —Ed.

which are quite unknown. There still are alphabets to be deciphered and languages to be discovered; in these matters a rich harvest may yet be made. I do not think that the inquiries into eastern languages will ever be carried on with any excess of zeal; but I do believe that we shall arrive at a point where we may regard them as a step gained for further historical investigations. When the Zend language is once discovered, we shall be able to read the inscriptions of Persepolis, and also those of Babylon. These things may be likened to the horizon: the farther you advance, the more the circle widens. Historical knowledge is as capable of extension as physical knowledge, and great discoveries remain yet to be made. Klopstock says: "Many laurels are yet to be gained," we must only strive to gain them. The Spanish inscriptions have been treated as senselessly as the Etruscan ones, nay, even more so. Without any point to start from, which is not quite wanting in the Etruscan inscriptions, these Spanish records have been explained by means of a barbarous mixture of Greek and Latin, which the decipherers themselves invented for their own convenience. And such nonsense even finds its admirers! It will indeed be difficult to explain those inscriptions with the aid of the Basque language, for the present Basque is certainly not the same as that spoken in the time of the Romans, though it may not be as different as, for example, the modern high German literary language is from that of the earlier ages; but the difference certainly cannot be less than that existing between the present popular dialect of Suabia and that of the thirteenth century.

The nations of Spain presented the greatest differences in their manners, for they formed compact nations, and much closer unions than either in Greece or in Italy; but we cannot say what were the causes which kept up this union. Thus much is clear, that during the historical period most of the Iberian nations had their kings, whom the Romans call *reguli*. The Romans greatly respected the Spaniards on account of their courage and determination, but what

distinguishes them most, is their attachment to their chiefs, which was even stronger among the Iberians than among the Celts; it was quite common with the followers of a chief to make away with themselves, if he fell in battle, that they might serve him in his future state. Isolated instances of cities being defended with desperate courage also occur among other nations of antiquity, as in the case of Abydos and Petelia; but in Spain this was the general rule: the towns never surrendered either in their wars against Carthage or against Rome, and when they could no longer resist the force of hunger, they devoted themselves to destruction. The same obstinacy in defending their towns appears in the middle ages, and in modern times, as, for example, at Saragoza and Gerona: nothing in modern history can be compared with this, except the defence of Missolunghi.

Another peculiarity is, that the Spaniards, except the Celtiberians, had in antiquity the same weakness which still characterises them. I allude to the complete alienation and the great exasperation between the several nations; they show the same inveterate national hatred which still exists, e. g., between the Castilians and Aragonians. I was once acquainted with an Aragonian, who, though otherwise an honourable man, told me, that it would be quite impossible for him to form a friendship with a Castilian. The same is at present the case in Italy, but in former times people of the same race, such as the Sabellians, often faithfully kept together; but the Spanish nations never appear united. It is equally remarkable that the Spaniards, again excepting the Celtiberians, though excellent defenders of their towns, are good for nothing as soldiers in the field. The Spanish militia defended itself behind its walls, but did not persevere in the field; the Samnites, on the other hand, are the very reverse, for they are by no means distinguished in their sieges. In Condé's history of the Arabs, a general, in his despatch to the Kaliph, says of the Spaniards: on horseback they are eagles, in the defence of their towns, lions, but in the field

they are women. Such they were in the wars against the Arabs, and such also in those against Napoleon: they never fought a battle in the open field that did not bring disgrace upon them; and the same men, who, in their towns, would bury themselves under their ruins, rather than listen to a word about capitulation, took to flight without any necessity. The Celtiberians, on the other hand, appear in a very favourable light; and the Cantabrians and Asturians, too, defended themselves in their mountains almost as in fortresses.

All Spain is full of towns.

Modern Andalusia, the country of the Turdetani, claims a very ancient civilisation, for its inhabitants had a literature and laws composed in verses, and are also said to have had a kind of historical books.

In the traditions of the Greeks, Iberia belongs to Hesperia, and their earliest information about it refers to *Tartessus*, which was visited at an early period by the Phocaeans. Its situation is beyond a doubt; it is justly placed in the neighbourhood of Seville, near the mouth of the Baetis; but whether it was a town or a country, whether as a town it was different from Hispalis, or whether it was identical with ancient Hispalis, these are questions which we can answer only by conjectures.

GADES (*Gadir*, in Phoenician and Hebrew "a fence") is the most ancient settlement of which we have any accurate information. In the Heracleae, the island on which Gades was situated was called *Erythea*, and the ancients say that it consisted of two islands, a circumstance which has caused much difficulty to modern geographers, as it was impossible to find the two islands. But no Andalusian would be puzzled by it. Cadiz, together with Leon, now certainly forms one island, but originally Cadiz was an island by itself, and its present union with Isla de Leon is the consequence of a causeway, which was made at a time unknown to us, from Gades to the larger island; this artificial causeway is discernible even at the present day. Gades was a Phoenician

settlement, independent of Carthage, and as truly Punic as the latter city itself. But when the prosperity of Carthage rose higher and higher, and when, at the same time, that of the other Phoenician colonies was sinking more and more, then Gades also was obliged to acknowledge the supremacy of Carthage. Nothing is more natural and more in accordance with human passions and feelings, than that this Punic city was more hostile to the Carthaginians than any other place that had been subdued by them; we cannot, therefore, be surprised at finding that, in the course of the second Punic war, its hatred of Carthage led it to declare in favour of the Romans, as Utica did afterwards. Hence Gades obtained very favourable terms from the Romans, and remained a privileged city until the time of the emperors; afterwards it received the Roman franchise. Cadiz is one of those places which experienced scarcely any reverses of fortune in ancient times; and, with the exception of the barbarous invasion of the Arabs, I do not know that Cadiz was ever visited by a single misfortune.

Part of the coast of Granada was likewise occupied by Punians, for MALACCA (the royal city) also was a Punic colony. Before the dominion of the Carthaginians, the inhabitants were called *Bastuli*. Here, as well as in Africa, the facility with which the Phoenicians became amalgamated with foreign nations is very striking.

CARTHAGO (the modern *Carthagena*, properly *Cartha Chadta* or New Town) was the real capital of the Carthaginians in Spain, and its name is as common as the Greek Neapolis. Notwithstanding its importance and strength, the town was not as large as we are inclined to imagine; at the time of its capture by Scipio, it appears small both in population and circumference, if we compare it with other maritime cities and capitals. It was founded by Hamilcar Barcas, who first established the dominion of the Carthaginians in Spain, which, however, was not of long duration. Though Gades and the towns on the coast of Granada were Punic, we must not, on that account

imagine that, previously to the time of Hamilcar Barcas, the Carthaginians had a province there. Their influence, indeed, was great even before; their commerce was extensive and lucrative, the Spanish mines may have been chiefly worked by Punians, and Spain was the recruiting place for their armies; but no part of Spain was a Carthaginian province before the end of the first Punic war. It was the great idea of Hamilcar Barcas richly to indemnify his country for the loss of Sardinia and Sicily, an idea which no one was better qualified to realise than he, by paralysing the Romans with determination, cunning, and skill. The lately-discovered precious fragments from Diodorus throw great light upon the admirable manner in which he carried this plan into effect. Turdetania was subdued first, Hannibal then carried the war almost as far as Salamanca, and the modern New Castile and Valencia were subdued by him. These acquisitions, however, must not be regarded as permanent conquests, the object of the Carthaginians being rather to terrify the Spaniards and to accustom them to a feeling of dependence. The Carthaginians were otherwise hard and hated masters, but the great Hamilcar, his great successor Hasdrubal, and the great sons of Hamilcar, founded the Carthaginian dominion in Spain in such a manner as to secure to Carthage the attachment of the natives, a point in which the Romans never succeeded. Much depended upon circumstances, the Carthaginians, e.g., were less rigorous in observing the connubium than the Romans, and Hannibal himself married a Spanish woman of Castulo, which shows what liberty was allowed in this respect: when the commander-in-chief of a province did this, we may easily imagine in what manner persons of inferior rank acted. The Romans had no connubium at all with the natives.

If we proceed to the interior of Andalusia, we find the valley of the Baetis to be one of the richest and most fertile countries in Europe; it is still a paradise, and will ever remain so, in spite of the devastations of war and the worst government. I know, from an eye-witness, who saw the

country in the years 1810 and 1811, that its prosperity and high state of cultivation were altogether unchanged, and quite as good as before.

HISPALIS (the Arabs call it *Iabilia*, whence the modern name *Sevilla*) was the ancient capital of those parts. It does not act a prominent part in history, and is not often mentioned; but we know that, notwithstanding the greatness of Gades, it had its own importance, as sea ships sailed up as far as Hispalis. In the time of the Romans, it seems to have risen still higher in consequence of various favours conferred upon it.

CORDUBA was the real Roman capital of the province; it was, no doubt, an ancient Spanish town with a Roman colony, which bears the strange name of *Colonia Patricia Corduba*. It is as impossible for us to understand what circumstance gave rise to this name, as it is to determine the time at which the colony was founded. It was not a military colony, nor can it have been founded before the year of the city 641, in which year[1] Narbo, the first Roman colony out of Italy, was founded. This event caused great sensation, for until then all attempts to establish colonies in foreign countries had failed. Corduba, therefore, cannot have been founded before the seventh century; and it perhaps belongs to the time when Metellus had the command in Baetica. Corduba is destined by nature to be a princely city; and it was the centre of Roman civilisation and literature in those parts. It was not only the native place of the Senecas, but it was so completely a Latin town, that *poetae Cordubenses* were spoken of even in Cicero's time; they were not indeed mentioned with praise, but it was not their language that was censured; they were deficient only in manner and in skill. In the history of literature, Corduba is remarkable as the native place of the family of the Senecas; it afterwards retained the same importance which it had during the first century. It passed from the hands of the

[1] More correctly in 634, M. Porcio Catone, Q. Marcio Rege Coss. See *Vell. Pat.* i.15.—ED.

Romans into those of the Goths, and lastly into those of the Arabs; but it is always honourably spoken of as a distinguished city.

If I had time to dwell longer on this subject, I might relate to you much that is of great interest about Baetica; but for the present I will select only two localities.

SALTUS CASTULONENSIS, leading to Castulo, is exactly the same road across the Sierra Morena, which leads to Andujar. In the history of the Roman wars, it is very important, and again became so in 1808, when General Dupont was obliged to surrender there.

MUNDA was situated in the mountains of Granada. It seems strange to us, that the war between Caesar and the sons of Pompey was decided in those parts, so near the coast at the extreme end of Spain; but if we consider the nature of the localtity, we cease to wonder: the country is strong and fertile at the same time, so that the armies were not in danger of suffering from want of provisions. This shews that the sons of Pompey were wise in establishing themselves there.

The inhabitants of Baetica were called by the Romans *Turduli* and *Turdetani*. People generally distinguish between these two names, and I believe that Strabo did so too; but I think that they are only intended to indicate slight shades of difference between two people of the same race.

The country of the *Edetani* (the modern province of Valencia) had VALENTIA for its capital. You remember my mentioning the fact that Roman names of places were derived from verbs of which the meaning was a favourable omen. Valentia is an instance of this, and another town of the same name existed in Italy. Other names of the same kind are Pollentia, Potentia, Florentia, Vincentia, Faventia, etc. The town of Valentia was a Roman settlement; I do not believe that it was a colony, but it must have been founded at an early time, for it is certainly mentioned in the war of Sertorius. It is situated on the river Turia,

which is celebrated in antiquity for the glorious but unsuccessful battle of Sertorius.

The ancient town of SAETABIS, one of the largest manufacturing places of Spain, was situated in the same district; a very fine kind of linen was made there from flax grown in the country.

SAGUNTUS or SAGUNTUM (both forms are supported by authority), was situated to the north of Valentia. It is well-known that this place was the occasion of the second Punic war, and Polybius in speaking of it makes a beautiful and correct observation respecting the difference between the immediate occasion and the cause of a war. Saguntum was the occasion, but certainly not the cause of the war. It is very singular that not only Appian, whose geographical ignorance of Spain surpasses everything, but even Roman authors almost universally assume Saguntum to have been situated on the left side of the Ebro; this, however, is a mistake, for it was situated on its right side, and at a considerable distance from it to the south. According to one tradition, it was a colony of Ardea, that is, a Tyrrhenian settlement and it is very probable that there may have been a Tyrrhenian admixture; but according to others it was an Achaean colony of Zacynthos: the resemblance of the name was too tempting not to suggest the derivation. The Tyrrhenians are often called Achivi, and as Zacynthos was Achivan, both things were mixed together in this manner. It is much more credible that Saguntum was a colony of Ardea, founded at a time when the Ardeatans were great and powerful. Taraco, on the opposite side of the river, is likewise said to have been a Tyrrhenian town. But admitting that the Saguntines were originally Tyrrhenians, they certainly, in the course of time, became complete Spaniards, as many other colonists identified themselves with the natives; and the Saguntines, against whom Hannibal fought, were Spaniards. It would lead too far here to speak of the fate of Saguntum, and of the uncritical

treatment of its history by Livy, and his strange misconceptions. Livy, in this part of his work, probably followed Caelius Antipater, and thereby spoiled the beginning of his third decad, which is otherwise so excellent: his account of Saguntum is a childish exaggeration, and well suited to a rhetorician like Caelius. Saguntum was restored by the Romans, and remained a considerable town under the empire; large ruins of an amphitheatre still exist near Murviedro.

We now come to the Iberus, into which several rivers from the north discharge their waters; one of these, the *Sicoris* (Segre), is a river of some importance. The Romans acquired influence and formed connections in the country between the Ebro and the Pyrenees about the same time when Hamilcar was actively engaged in the south to extend the power of Carthage; and the inhabitants of Catalonia, at least those on the coast, had at that time already submitted to the Romans. As the power of the Carthaginians was spreading in Spain, the Catalonians thought they could protect themselves only by applying to some distant state which had no armies in the neighbourhood, which levied no taxes, and to which they had only to furnish troops in case of need. TARACO, properly the capital of all Spain, was the chief city in fair Catalonia throughout the Roman period; and from it *Hispania Taraconensis*, which embraced the greater part of Spain, derived its name. After the time of the Hannibalian war there were two *Hispaniae*, and one praetor resided at Carthagena, and the other at Taraco. It was in its character of a capital that Taraco had a temple of Roma and Augustus. It was a wealthy place, but afterwards declined, and in the middle ages it was eclipsed by the neighbouring—

Barcelona, which, however, is not mentioned during the period of the Roman republic, but only under the empire. Its ancient name is BARCINO; the termination *no* or *ino* is of common occurrence, as for example, in Ruscino, and seems to have been a dialectic peculiarity of those parts.

Barcelona has an excellent harbour, and its situation is very strong on account of the mountain which rises above the city. At the time of the Visigoths, it surpassed Taragona in importance, but in ancient history it does not occur.

On a more distant part of the coast, we meet with two Greek settlements, EMPORIAE, from which the modern Ampurias has its name, and RHODE. The latter is called a Rhodian colony; but Rhode, as well as Emporiae, was probably a colony of Massilia, by whose support it was maintained.

The country between the Ebro and the Pyrenees was in ancient times inhabited by many small tribes, as the Ilergetes, Lacetani, Cosetani, etc.[1]

ILERDA, the modern Lerida on the Sicoris, is a town of great historical importance in the interior of Catalonia. It is remarkable in the history of Rome, and especially that of Caesar, who there compelled Afranius and Petreius to capitulate. These events, which are interesting in themselves, also show how an extraordinary man overcomes the

[1] "Geography is a pleasant and easy study: the vivid representations it furnishes us of localities, often enable us clearly to understand an historical event; we often see, e. g., why a victory was not followed up, or how it might have been followed up. I do not like to set myself up as a pattern, but when I was a young man of your age, or even younger (I was scarcely seventeen years old), I read Strabo with the greatest attention. Whenever I had read a book, I endeavoured to reproduce it by writing down an abstract of it. It is not advisable to rely on books; and I therefore endeavoured to produce the substance in another form. Those who go through Strabo in this manner, even in their leisure hours, cannot fail to acquire a thorough knowledge of geography. Let those who have any taste for chorography read books of travel and similar works, as for example, Bory de St. Vincent, *Tableau de la peninsule de l'Ibérie*, or Alex. Laborde, *Tableau de l'Espagne*, which are especially valuable in assisting us to understand Livy's account of the Spanish war. Strabo's description of Spain is particularly excellent, but he is too often carried away by his learning and his desire to explain the Homeric poems; by reading his description you acquire an indelible and correct picture of Spain. A scholar must read the ancient authors systematically and repeatedly, sometimes with one particular object in view, and sometimes with another."

most difficult circumstances, and gains advantages even where all chances seem to be against him.

OSCA (now Huesca), an ancient town farther inland, in Aragon, was, for a long time the head-quarters of the great Sertorius. It must have been a town of great importance to Spain, for the standard of the Spanish coinage is called *argentum Oscense.*

We have thus rapidly passed along the whole coast from the Baetis to the Pyrenees; but in the valley of the Ebro I have still to notice CAESARAUGUSTA (Saragoza). Spain is the real country of the great and flourishing military colonies of the Romans; Gaul had but few of them, such as Cologne, which, however, was of a mixed character, as Germans there dwelt together with the veterans. Cologne and Lyons were national towns rather than real military colonies of the Romans; but those in Spain were pure military colonies, differing from those of Italy in the fact that the latter, with the exception of Placentia and Cremona, were established in towns which had existed before, whereas those in Spain consisted of newly-built towns. These foundations of towns belong to the age of Augustus and his successors. Augustus evidently had a twofold object in view, first to reward his veterans, and secondly to Romanise the Spaniards. The population in those parts had been almost annihilated during the unfortunate wars, and hence Augustus sent out whole legions to establish themselves there. In this manner arose *Emerita Augusta*, the modern Merida, which must have been an immensely large town, for it contained the veterans of three legions. He gave them extensive estates, so that the territory of the town must have been a whole province, and the ancient inhabitants could not possibly till their lands. The veterans became the lords of the soil. Caesaraugusta was a town of this kind. Augustus was a distinguished man, whatever we may think of him; in regard to intellect and talent we may rate him very low, and I believe that he even deserves to be ranked lower than is generally done; but he was a ruler

of great ability; and the fact that the time in which he lived was deplorable and full of confusion, must not induce us to be unjust towards him. The age in which he lived was morally bad, but the cause of this lay in the period which preceded it, just as the horrors of the French revolution must be set down to the account of those who had the power in their hands before it broke out; had these men been better, the ferment of the dregs of the people would have met with quite a different resistance. But the whole fabric was rotten and in a state of dissolution. In like manner the age of Augustus was bad, because it was the offspring of a bad and corrupt period. It was as impossible to save the Roman republic, as it was to restore the republic of Florence after the reign of Alexander de Medici. The men who had conspired against Caesar may have been the best and noblest, but they were extremely unwise, they ought to have taken into account the actual circumstances. Alcmaeon, the profound Pythagorean, says, that men perish, if they do not understand how to fit the beginning to the end.[1] This is very frequently the case in history; and hence the noblest endeavours often lead to unfortunate results. The regulations of Augustus for the government of the state were, for the most part, extremely praiseworthy. I do not mean to say that it was his object to lead the nation to what is good and noble, or to ennoble their motives for action—in this he, like many other statesmen, had no faith—but he wanted to prepare for his subjects' security an undisturbed existence, and outward prosperity; and in this respect his efforts were well directed, and he did not regard the Romans as slaves. In like manner, his regulations concerning the provinces were very rational, and his colonies, among which Caesaraugusta has immortalised his name more than any other, are proofs of the same wisdom.

Emerita Augusta, Pax Augusta (Badajoz), *Pax Julia* (Beja,

[1] In Aristotle, *Probl.* xvii. 3: *τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φησὶν Ἀλκμαίων διὰ τοῦτο ἀπόλλυσθαι, ὅτι οὐ δύνανται ἀρχὴν τῷ τέλει προσάψαι.*

in southern Portugal) are similar colonies in the interior. These are the principal ones, for there are several more, which are less celebrated. Vespasian afterwards continued the same system, whence several Spanish places have the surname *Flavia*. They were, however, no longer absolutely Roman colonies, but Spanish towns upon which he engrafted military colonies. This lasted until the second century, and I remember no colony of a more recent date than the reign of Trajan. *Legio*, the modern Leon, was likewise such a military colony; even at present its walls remind us of the form of a Roman camp, and all military colonies of the Romans regularly had the form of a camp.

We shall pass through the country from west to east, but can consider it only in masses. The westernmost people were the LUSITANIANS, occupying a country somewhat different in extent from the modern kingdom of Portugal, for it did not extend so far north, and in the south it did not go beyond the frontier of Algarbia, but in the east, it extended much farther into Spain. The Lusitanians were the most civilised among all the Spanish nations. They do not seem to have been subdivided, but to have formed one compact state with one national government, which, however, does not appear to have had a high degree of intensity, as is proved by the history of Viriathus. At the time when the Romans made themselves masters of Spain, the Lusitanians distinguished themselves by their perseverance and firmness; their valour is displayed in the great undertaking of Viriathus for their liberty. Every one knows the cruelty and faithlessness of Servius Galba, who induced them to enter into a capitulation with the Romans, and then treacherously massacred the greater part of them.

OLISIPO was even then the most important town in Lusitania. We may assume, without any hesitation, that, under the Roman emperors, the country enjoyed a far higher degree of prosperity than at present; Spain, on the

other hand, on its first appearance in history, is in a state of great disorganisation. Owing to its situation, Olisipo was a great emporium even under the Romans.

We pass over other Lusitanian places: I have already told you that two Celtic tribes dwelt in the country of Portugal, the *Celtici* in the south near the frontier of Algarbia, and the *Celtae* in the north between the Douro and Minho.

The ORETANI occur on the Orospeda in Spain proper, north of the Sierra Morena; but I will not mention all the tribes, I shall confine myself to two which act a prominent part in ancient history, and the districts of which must be known in order to understand the campaigns of Hannibal: I allude to the CARPETANI and VACCAEI. The former dwelt about the Tagus; although it is not expressly said, that *Toletum* (Toledo) was their capital, we must in all probability suppose it to have been their central town. This town, owing to its central position, is destined by nature to be a capital, and such we find it to have been under the Goths. In the time of the Romans also it must have been a place of great importance, though it is not mentioned as the seat of the praetor: this is one of the obscure points in the history of the fourth and fifth centuries. Afterwards, in the time of the Moors, it was the residence of the governors and kaliphs, and subsequently of the kings of Castile, until the seat of government was absurdly transferred to Madrid, for Toledo has a much more splendid situation in a far more healthy district. The *Carpetani* (*Καρπήσιοι*) act a prominent part in the third book of Polybius and in the twenty-first of Livy, for they offered a brave resistance to the Carthaginians during their progress towards the interior of the country.

The *Vaccaei* dwelt on the Durius, and *Salmantica*, the modern Salamanca, was their capital. This was the farthest point to which Hannibal advanced in his campaigns. The Vaccaei, in their struggle against the Romans, appear as one of the most heroic nations.

All these tribes were completely Iberian; but further east we reach IDUBEDA, the mountains of Soria, a ramification of the Pyrenees between the Tagus and Durius on the one hand, and the Iberus on the other, and extending as far as the Sierra Morena, which separates Aragon from Castile as completely as the Pyrenees separate Spain from France. The language of the Aragonese is Provençal and quite foreign to the Castilian. Those mountains were inhabited by four tribes, which are of great celebrity in Roman history under the common name of the CELTIBERIANS. The most important among them are the *Aruaci* or *Arevaci* and *Berones;* and their chief town was NUMANTIA, which has acquired imperishable fame in history. The tribe to which Numantia belonged was insignificant, and the town is an instance of a phenomenon which is otherwise of rare occurrence in Spain, namely, it was independent of the tribe to which it belonged. I have already stated, that the Celtiberians must be regarded as Iberians, who subdued the Celts, though the latter maintained themselves in the country. The Iberian character of pride and perseverance shows itself most strikingly in them, because they were the masters there, and in a most favourable situation, living among a subject population upon which they could devolve the burdens of life. However much accurate historical knowledge may be lost, yet it is certain that the Celtiberians are one of the most respectable nations of antiquity, *non sine laude nominandi.* During the Carthaginian period, they preserved their liberty unimpaired; but when the Romans systematically undertook the subjugation of Spain, they first came in contact with the Celtiberians, who had formerly been on terms of friendship with them, and had served in their armies as mercenaries. But when attempts were made upon their liberty, they refused to listen to any terms of submission. They were intelligent enough to look upon the war with the Romans as a great misfortune; when, therefore, Tib. Gracchus, the father of the illustrious tribunes, and a son of the Tib. Gracchus

who had fallen at Beneventum in the Hannibalian war, had the supreme command in Spain, the Celtiberians, having confidence in his honesty, concluded peace with him on terms which the weaker people could accept without disgracing itself, and by which their existence was not so far degraded as to make death preferable. They observed the peace conscientiously, but not so the Romans, who, at last, under the second Scipio, succeeded in destroying Numantia: that victory is a degradation to Scipio as much as, in the reign of Tiberius, it was a degradation to the men who were obliged to lend their names to pass disgraceful *senatus consulta*.

Some of the Celtiberian towns were protected only by their situation; this was the case at Numantia, though certainly not with any reference to Sparta on principle, for as the town had no more than 4000 armed men, such a principle would have been ill suited to them, and it would not assuredly have been any degradation to protect the town by means of fortifications.

The Celtiberians, that is, the remnants of the devoted nation, afterwards re-appear in a remarkable manner in the time of Sertorius. They were not all united in their attachment to him, a singular proof of the clear and rational manner in which those Spaniards viewed their altered circumstances, although they had very great men for their leaders. They did not look backwards, and their object was neither to restore the condition of independence which had existed previously to the Hannibalian war and which it was impossible to revive, nor yet absolutely to repel the Romans. They readily availed themselves of the presence of Sertorius for the purpose of forming themselves into an Hispano-Latin nation and of acquiring a national existence, which promised a development from the actual circumstances. This is a very interesting fact, and deserves to be well pondered over: after great changes of circumstances, light sometimes dawns on men; they do not look back into the past, but set before them a fixed object suited

to their circumstances, and do not follow any visionary schemes. Thus the Celtiberians were now ready to do what their ancestors a hundred years before would not have done. But they did not succeed. The fall of Sertorius and the victory of the Romans were things over which they had no control; Providence here decided the issue, and the failure does not prove that their undertaking was not wisely calculated.

There now only remains the northern region of Spain, which extends from the western sea to the Gallic frontier. We there meet with three principal tribes, viz., the CALLAICI (in modern Galicia), the ASTURES (in Asturia and the greater part of Leon), and the CANTABRI (in Biscay in its greatest extent). These three nations had many things in common both in their national character and in that of the country they inhabited; though this circumstance does not exclude essential differences. The Callaici were the first that were conquered by the Romans, which was accomplished as early as the commencement of the seventh century, by Dec. Brutus, hence surnamed Callaicus. But still his campaign did not produce any permanent results in regard to the occupation of Spain, the consequences being scarcely more lasting than those of the campaign of Domitius Ahenobarbus on the Elbe. The Astures and Cantabri, on the other hand, maintaining their independence much longer, were not subdued until the period from the year 14 to 10 B.C., or 740 of the city. Augustus himself conducted the war against those little mountain tribes for three or four years, employing all the resources of the empire which could at that time send hundreds of thousands into the field. Hence we cannot think of the national efforts of those Spanish nations without feeling a high degree of respect for them. But as the Saxons maintained themselves after the cruel butcheries of Charlemagne, and as the Westphalians and Lower Saxons are among the most unchanged of the tribes of Germany, and developed themselves with greater freedom and national individuality than the

nations of southern Germany; so the Cantabri and Astures preserved their independence and nationality in spite of the Roman conquest. The Astures, however, did not succeed so completely as the Cantabri; Romans must have settled among the former, which led them to adopt the Roman language, whereas the Cantabri at this day speak the ancient Spanish language, and their present institutions, which have no doubt grown out of their very ancient customs, might certainly throw light upon their ancient laws and institutions. But unfortunately, so far as I know, satisfactory information about these matters is not to be found anywhere. The Cantabri were afterwards called *Vascones*, and in our days Basque. The very name of Astorga (*Asturica*), the ancient capital of the country, shews that Asturia comprised the greater part of Leon.

The Romans divided Spain into *Hispania citerior* and *ulterior*, which was quite a matter of accident, as after the Hannibalian war they had two armies and two praetors in Spain. Gradually Roman settlements were formed, the armies remained there for a long time, and the soldiers married native women. Hence, as is the case in India through the English troops, a half cast people arose, who were foreign to the Romans, but regarded themselves as Latin, and gradually acquired various kinds of privileges. This gave rise to the foundation of the town of ITALICA, where the sons of those Romans assembled; Valentia probably arose in the same manner. Until the time of Galba, the Spaniards, with the exception of the Roman colonists, were subjects, but that emperor conferred on some of them, and Vespasian upon all, the *jus Latii*, in the later sense, in which Pompeius Strabo had conferred it upon the Transpadani.[1]

Iberian tribes dwelt not only on the south, but also on the north of the Pyrenees. Caesar, whom Tacitus justly calls *summus auctorum*, in fact, calls the Aquitanians a people of the Iberian race. They inhabited the modern

[1] See above, p. 33.

Guienne, extending but little beyond the Garonne. It is still doubtful whether all the tribes south of the Garonne were Iberians; the Bituriges in Burdigala can scarcely have belonged to them. It was probably not a compact Spanish population, the basis was Celtic. Hence Ausonius speaks of Burdigala as a Celtic town, for in one passage he mentions Celtic as the native language of its inhabitants. In the districts immediately bordering upon Spain, however, the Spaniards undoubtedly predominated, and in fact, even at the present day the Basque language is spoken at Bayonne, and as far as Bearn.

GALLIA.

Caesar represents Gaul as bounded by the Pyrenees, the sea, the Alps and the Rhine. This unfortunate statement about the Rhine has been appealed to as a reason for separating from Germany the country in which we are living, an idea which has taken root in the heads of many men, and is still frequently expressed, especially by Frenchmen, without paying any regard to the fact that this country was inhabited by Germans. The expression of Caesar is nothing else than a loose definition of what in his time was regarded as Gaul, and without making any pretensions to accuracy. For when he says that Gaul consists of Aquitania, Celtica, and Belgium, he employs the name in much too extensive a sense, according to the custom of deriving the name of a country from that of its inhabitants, for Aquitania was Iberian and did not belong to it. On the other hand, the greater part of Britain and Hibernia was likewise inhabited by Gauls, nay, in Caesar's time, they extended over the south of Germany, while at a somewhat earlier period, in the time of the Cimbri, they not only were in possession of

southern Germany and Lombardy, but also of Bohemia and Pannonia, down to the very heart of Thrace, the country of the Ukraine, beyond the river Dniepr, and even a portion of Asia Minor. The Tectosagae, in Asia Minor, were as much Gauls as those on the Rhone. The name Gaul, therefore, is something purely accidental. The Latin terminology, which at an earlier period correctly made Picenum the frontier of Gaul, is in this instance very incorrect in including Belgium as a part of Gaul, whereas it ought to have been called Cimbria, for the Belgae were essentially different from the Gauls.

What I have here said about the nature of Gaul, is intended as a justification of Eratosthenes, a great man, who has been unjustly censured by Strabo, another very distinguished man, whom I never mention without gratitude and respect. Eratosthenes assigned to the Celts a vast extent of country: he disliked the common names of the parts of the earth because they appeared to him erroneous, and instead of them, he makes other great divisions, calling the north-west of Europe Celtica; he then places the Scythians in the north, and between these two, the Celto-Scythians (of course according to the inscription of Olbia, from which we learn that Celts had settled in the Ukraine),[1] in the east, the Indians, and again, between the Indians and Scythians, the Indo-Scythians; then the Ethiopians, and between these latter and the Indians, probably the Indo-Ethiopians, though they are not mentioned. Now, Strabo censures this view of the great extension of the Celts; and modern authors, who have written on the subject, have quietly repeated the censure, although it is quite unjust. We must not imagine that France alone was inhabited by Celts; but they occupied the extent of country described in their tradition, from the Sierra Morena, almost from the mouth of the Baetis, that is, from Lusitania in Spain to the country about the Tanais in the East; I do not, of course, here specify any particular time, but I speak in general.

[1] Comp. *Kleine Schrift.* vol. i. p. 384.

To confound the Germans with the Celts is an error, which, though now less common than formerly, still makes its appearance here and there. I can speak positively on this subject, because I am to some extent acquainted with the Celtic language, and because, in my earlier years, I spent some time in Scotland, where I became intimately acquainted with the language spoken in the Highlands. I have a distinct recollection of it, and know a great many of its words. I can positively assert, that the grammar has not the least resemblance to the German; its conjugation and declension by changes at the beginning of words is quite foreign to the German dialects. If, e. g., a word in the nominative begins with *m*, it forms the genitive by a *w*; conjugation is effected by auxiliary verbs, but the system is quite different from ours. It is true that a considerable number of words are German or Scandinavian; but these can be recognised at once as foreign importations, for they have no connection with Celtic roots. The Highlanders are not a wild people, and I am very fond of them, but they are unpolished. Their foreign words are for the most part such as denote domestic furniture or anything which presupposes a state of civilisation above the merest elements, such as a chair, a bench, and the like; words of this kind are generally of German or Scandinavian origin. Such foreign words can very easily be recognised in all languages. Many words, on the other hand, have a manifest affinity with Latin; this is undeniable; but I do not by any means wish to intimate that they are imported, for how could they have got into the language of the Scottish Highlanders? I have said in my history, that there are affinities between languages spoken by different nations, without their being genealogically traceable to one nation, and without one nation being descended from the other; but they stand to each other in the relation of varieties which, owing to certain common peculiarities, belong to the same species. Such is the case between the Celtic and Latin. Pliny calls the polar sea *mare Cronium*, which

English and Scotch scholars explain quite simply and correctly as *mar Cronni*, that is, Frozen sea.

The Celts, so far as we can trace them, differ immensely from the Germans not only in their language, but in their religion, their manners, and, in short, in everything. About sixty or seventy years ago, the false belief in their identity was so general in Germany, that no one entertaining a different opinion would have been listened to, although the testimonies of the ancients are clear, and no reader of Caesar can believe him to be in favour of the identity. The same is the case with Tacitus, who distinguishes the German, Gallic, and Pannonian languages.

Another erroneous opinion, though less general, is, that the Gauls and Belgae were in reality one nation, or at least that the Belgae were a mixture of Gauls and Germans. It is true that some support of this opinion may be found in the best ancient writers, but those who maintain it confound that which is accidental with that which is general. I will not doubt that the inhabitants of northern Belgium and of the Netherlands are mixed; the mixture, however, does not consist of Gauls, but of Cymri and Germans. We must not in any way conceive the relation between Gauls and Belgae, as if the former were pure, and the latter mixed Celts. Gauls and Belgae exist at this day, and are different in language and names: under the name of *Gael*, we find them in Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland, and under that of *Cymri* or *Bolgs* in Wales and Britany. Formerly they were much more widely spread, all over the west of England, from Cornwall to Cumberland, and the Picts also belonged to them; they called themselves *Bolgs* or *Firbolgs* (from *fir*, a man, *Belgian men*). This nation is confounded by the ancients with the Gauls, and in the accounts of their emigration they are simply called Galli, *Γαλάται*; they were however, Cymri, not indeed exclusively, but at least chiefly. This is clear even from the fact that, both in Macedonia and Italy, their king is called Brennus; and it has long been known, that *brenin* both in Welsh and in the

language of lower Britany signifies king. The Romans took it to be a proper name, just as they did in the case of the Etruscan Lucumo. This Cymrian language has been confounded with the Gaelic of the Highlands of Scotland, and the two have been spoken of as dialects of the same language; but this is certainly incorrect. I myself know little about it, but quite enough to agree with those who maintain, that they are two different languages, not indeed as different as Basque and Gaelic, for the Basque has not the least resemblance to either of them. I once heard an English officer boldly assert, that soldiers from the Highlands of Scotland conversed with the people of Ireland; but this is as impossible as it would be for a person unacquainted with Slavonic to converse with a Slavonian. No native Gael can understand the smallest Welsh sentence; the whole grammar of the two is different. It is further said that the two languages have a number of words in common, and that one fourth of all the words are akin to one another; but this statement seems suspicious, as it is not confirmed by any glossary. But admitting that the agreement actually exists, it is only a local affinity, two nations having in some points a resemblance, while their fundamental characters are nevertheless different; so that they have either diverged immensely from the same root, or else incline towards each other, proceeding from totally different races. An investigation of this subject belongs to general philology, and if it were always entered upon with sound principles, many prejudices would be dispersed, and much that is mysterious would be cleared up. According to what I have said, we cannot conceive the Belgae and Celts to be as nearly allied, as, e. g., the Scandinavians and Germans, or the Goths and Saxons, but they are as foreign to each other as the Persians and Slavonians; in the languages of the two last nations, many forms, nay, many particles and words, are the same, but the grammar is different. We must, therefore, be on our guard not to transfer to the Belgae that which we know of the Gauls; we know nothing

of the institutions of the former, while those of the Celts are well known. *Gael* is the root of the old German word *Welsh*, which signifies anything that is not German.

The Celts may have had much in common with the Cymri, but their constitution was peculiar to them; we have no proof to show that what Caesar says about them also applies to the Belgae. The existence of an aristocratic constitution, which, in the case of many other nations is assumed only from misinterpreted expressions, cannot be doubted among the Celts. We find among them two ruling tribes, the knights and the priests, the well-known Druids; the rest of the people were mere serfs. This circumstance, as I have observed on other similar occasions, intimates that the Celts, in the countries where we know them, were conquering foreigners, and that the power which drove them out of Spain, led them into a country, where, in their turn, they subdued other people. My conjecture is, that this latter people, extending over nearly the whole of France, was no other than the Cymri, who, being pressed by the Celts, advanced northward, and threw themselves upon German tribes; and this circumstance produced the mixture of Belgae and Germans in the north.

It is well known that the Druids were a caste,[1] but it is impossible to ascertain whether the Druids and knights were two different castes, like the Brahmins and warriors in India, or whether the Druids were only a branch of the military caste, which occupied itself with matters of religion. Certain it is, however, that all the power was divided between these two, while the people lived in a condition which Caesar describes by the term *clientela*, that is, bondage. It was not exactly what we call serfdom; for the Celtic people were dependent only in relation to their feudal lords, whose retinue they formed, but in other respects they were free; and besides them, slaves are expressly mentioned.

The religion of the Druids was bloody and cruel, and for this reason it was the only one that was attacked by the

[1] See, however, *Hist. of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 527.

Romans; though they may have done so also because that religion formed an obstacle to the Romanising of Gaul. Success was not difficult, and the Druids were completely crushed. It is possible that some of the later commotions of which we read in Tacitus, as, e. g., those of Sacrovir and Classicus, may have been connected with religion. The Druids also were the depositories of a kind of science and literature, for they had poems which it was unlawful to commit to writing. In the transactions of ordinary life, they used the Greek alphabet.

In the time of Caesar, it would be erroneous to speak of the Gauls as a really barbarous nation. It is true that everything connected with the arts, such as their coins and idols, is detestable, but in other things they seem to have reached the same stage of civilization at which our ancestors were in the time of the Othos. The population was very large; but the Cimbrian war made fearful havoc, and the misery resulting from it surpasses all our conceptions. In the time of Caesar, they had only partially recovered from it, and yet they present the appearance of a pretty strong population: their towns were considerable, the country was well cultivated; and all we hear of them suggests to us the idea of a rude rather than a barbarous state of things. The Romans became acquainted with water-mills and saw-mills in Gaul, nor were manufactures wanting there; but the Gauls were prevented by their treaties with the Romans from cultivating vines and olives. Their style of architecture is very common among ourselves, but was utterly unknown among the Greeks and Romans: the buildings consisted of wooden frames and wicker work, and even the walls of their towns were joined by means of beams, a method which was very surprising to the Romans. This is the reason why there are so very few remains of the ante-Roman period.

The Gauls very quickly adopted the civilisation of the Romans, who established themselves in the southern province about the year of the city 630, and thence extended

their dominion towards Lyons. In Pliny's time that country was so completely changed, that he declares it to be not a province but a true Italy. The rest of Gaul also soon became Romanised, though the Latin language did not spread there with equal facility; and we may probably assume that at the time of the Frankish conquest the Celtic language had not yet become extinct. Still, however, a dialect of Latin, different in character from our Latin, was diffused all over Gaul; and this is the root of the Romance or Provençal language. The study of Roman literature spread more and more; Gaul always had men of good abilities, and thus a peculiar literature was formed, of which Rheims, then called *Durocortorum*, was the seat and centre. I think I have discovered a new proof of an ancient rustic form of this name, according to which it was pronounced *Durocortoro*; I allude to a fragment from Fronto in Consentius:[1] *et illae vestrae Athenae Durocortoro*, where the corrupt termination is probably intentional, Fronto sneering at Consentius, because the inhabitants of the country did not correctly pronounce the name of their own university town.

The inclination of the Gauls to separate from Rome, and to constitute themselves as a distinct nation, manifests itself as early as the reign of Tiberius, and then again under Vespasian. Afterwards, we have the insurrection of Clodius Albinus, in the reign of Septimius Severus, and another in that of Gallienus, when, for a time, the Gauls had their own emperors, who resided at Treves, until Tetricus betrayed them to Aurelian. In all these movements we find, at an early date, considerable symptoms of a feeling of nationality, which was particularly strong during the fourth century, when Constantius Chlorus maintained himself there. Gaul always tried to set up opposition emperors: we must not, however, assert that this was so easy because those governors were stationed on the frontier, but it was because the nation met them in their desire. In the fifth

[1] p. 2031, ed. Putsch.

century, a peculiar literary spirit manifested itself in Gaul, and nearly all the more important productions of literature during that century, both ecclesiastical and profane, belong to Gaul. It possessed at that time many men of genius, whose only disadvantage is the fact of their language being quite rustic, that is, it is the language of common life. Men of this kind are: the talented Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop Salvianus of Marseilles, Claudianus Mamertus, Avitus, Cassianus, who was altogether a theological writer, but a man of great ability and genius, and Sulpicius Severus, who is even a very elegant writer, and deserves to be strongly recommended; his diction is not without faults, but he displays great intellectual worth, sound understanding, and a singular independence of judgment, at a time which bordered on a most terrible period. The Gauls, however, were excited rather than stunned by that unhappy period.

The whole of Gaul, which the Romans describe as their province, consisted of sixty-four *civitates*. In the time of Tiberius, there existed a number of separate tribes, each of which governed itself as a distinct state, and the same also continued afterwards. The Romans then divided Gaul into *Gallia Narbonensis, Aquitania,* and *Gallia Lugdunensis*. Each of these provinces consisted of a number of such *civitates*, which accordingly were both towns and states, and that more so than at present the French departments. They were absolutely subject to the Romans, but, before they obtained the Roman franchise, they had their own institutions. A *civitas* was governed by a senate, of which the members resided in the capital, and every thing was managed according to their ancient rights and usages. The Roman franchise was first conferred upon them under Augustus; but they did not obtain the right of being elected to high offices or into the Roman senate. This franchise, however, was confined to the *provincia Romana*, which extended as far north as Lyons. The particulars are not known, but some *civitates* within the Province had only the *jus Latii*.

Afterwards many individual Gauls obtained the full franchise, including the right of being elected into the Roman senate. Claudius extended the franchise to Gallia Narbonensis, at the same time conferring upon the inhabitants the right of becoming members of the senate. Under Galba, the remaining Gauls also obtained the franchise, but not the Belgae. Tacitus (*Ann.* iii. 44) states that the sixty-four Gallic *civitates* revolted, which no doubt is the sum total of all the Gallic *civitates*, though it is not certain whether Gallia Narbonensis is included or not.

After the Gallic migration, and previously to the Roman dominion in Gaul, some states had raised themselves to a kind of supremacy, and many others were in a condition of dependence. After the stormy period of migration, two tribes, the *Arverni* and *Aedui*, unfortunately for Gaul, had risen, and tried to crush each other, as Athens and Sparta did in Greece. About two hundred and sixty years after the capture of Rome by the Gauls, these two tribes were the most powerful in the country; and all the others were obliged to acknowledge the majesty of either the one or the other. The Romans, who protected the Allobroges, became involved in a war with the Arverni; and it must have been on that occasion, perhaps after the victory of Q. Fabius, that they concluded the alliance with the Aedui, in which the latter were declared *fratres populi Romani*: with their assistance, the Arverni were greatly humbled. After this, the Aedui were, for a time, at the head of affairs; but soon the Cymri or Cimbri, driven back from the east of Europe, inundated Gaul. The Aedui then lost their power, and the Sequani, in Franche Comté, rose in their place. Caesar's expressions on these affairs are unusual and strange, and require explanation.

The southern coast of Gaul, from the frontier of Catalonia, had formerly been inhabited by Ligurians. In the earliest times, they were mixed with Iberians, for Scylax of Caryanda says, that Ligyans, mixed with Iberians, occupied the country from the Pyrenees to the river Rhodanus. The

Iberians spread there as they did in Aquitania. The conquest of the Iberians is repeated in that of the Visigoths and of the Arabs, and extends as far as the Loire. The Iberians were the rulers, and the Ligurians the subject people. At a later period, the inhabitants of Languedoc were Gauls, who had evidently advanced again and taken a portion of the conquest from their conquerors, otherwise Caesar would have described the inhabitants of those districts as Iberians. The Gauls, probably, spread southward as well as eastward.

NARBO, on the coast, was a large commercial city, which had long been a great emporium, and from which a commercial road passed right through Gaul to the Loire. Its harbour is now filled up with sand, like nearly all others on that coast; in antiquity, it was very well adapted for merchant ships, though not for ships of war. During the period between the Gracchi and the Cimbrian war, the Romans founded there the town of *Narbo Martius* (in the provincial dialect *Narbona*), which, on account of its importance, was the provincial capital, without being politically the seat of the government. This was its condition in the time of Caesar and under the empire; but in the middle ages the place decreased in importance, because it is unhealthy.

Besides Narbo, there are very few important places in that beautiful hilly country between the Rhone and the Pyrences. I may mention, however, *Agatha*, a Massilian colony. *Nemausus* (Nismes) must have been a great city under the Romans, as we may infer from the ruins still existing. *Beterrae* (Beziers) can scarcely be believed to have been a Gallic town; many Greek coins, with beautiful Greek inscriptions have been found there; and I suspect that it was a Massilian settlement.

The coast from the Rhone to Italy ought not to be regarded as a part of Gaul, but of Liguria. How far the Ligurians dwelt inland, cannot be ascertained; but the neighbourhood of Avignon was inhabited by Celts mixed with Ligurians, as is manifest from the name of the *Celto-ligyans* who formed the population of that part. It is pro-

bable that the Ligurians extended on the one hand towards Italy as far as the Cottian Alps, and on the other, in Gaul as far as the frontier of the Allobroges and the Basses-Alpes. But in these latter parts, the Ligurians must be regarded as the original inhabitants, and the greater part of the coast was afterwards taken from them by the Iberians. Marseilles was not the only Greek city there, but a number of Greek settlements existed all along the coast: Nizza is the ancient *Nicaea*, Antibes is the ancient *Antipolis*, and the name of the *Hierian islands* shows that they were occupied by Greeks.

MASSALIA or MASSILIA. The origin of this city is frequently assigned to the reign of Cyrus, in consequence of a confusion between the settlement of the Phocaeans on the Ligurian coast, and their emigration after the conquest of their city by Harpagus; but the two events are quite distinct. Massalia was planted for commercial reasons, and was originally a factory, whereas the emigration of the Phocaeans was undertaken by them for the purpose of escaping from the dominion of the barbarians. Massalia did not contain those elements of growth and development which it would have had among a kindred people in Greece or Sicily; but it nevertheless became great at an early period, through its trade and commerce and through the reputation of its eunomia. Its relation of friendship with Rome was assuredly based on historical tradition and was very ancient; the presents sent by the Romans to the temple of Delphi were deposited in the treasury of the Massaliots. According to a statement of Trogus Pompeius in Justin, Massalia had to carry on serious wars with Carthage on account of the coral fisheries; Justin, indeed, speaks only of fisheries, but he probably alludes to the coral fisheries on the coast of Africa, which the Provençals possessed throughout the middle ages and down to the present day. Massalia acknowledged the supremacy of the Romans, who willingly and zealously supported the city against the neighbouring barbarians. In consequence of the fall of Carthage, the

commerce of Massalia seems to have been greatly extended, and after the destruction of Carthage, it appears, in fact, to have stepped into its place. We cannot say with certainty how long Greek culture maintained itself at Marseilles, but it certainly preserved it longer than is commonly believed; traces of it occur at a very late period, and copies of the Greek gospels were made there as late as the ninth and tenth centuries. In the third century of our era, it is still called a Greek city; when, however, the Ligurians began to become Romanised, their influence was irresistible, and even Greeks were overpowered by it.

ARELAS or ARELATE was a great place during the decline of the Roman empire and during the middle ages; the modern Arles, just as the modern Ravenna, is only a shadow of what it once was. In later times, Arelate was the capital of Gaul.

AQUAE SEXTIAE (Aix), the first town founded by the Romans in Gaul, was a military colony. It is celebrated for the victory which Marius gained there. There were several other military colonies on the Rhone and in Gallia Narbonensis, such as *Forum Julii* (Fréjus), *Avineo* (Avignon), *Arausio* (Oranges), *Nemausus* (Nismes), but not Narbo. In the interior, as well as in the west and on the north-eastern frontier, there were but few military colonies; Lyons was not one of them, but there existed several *coloniae civiles*. *Colonia Augusta Rauracorum* (Basle) was a military colony.

Beyond the Isara, we reach the extensive country of the ALLOBROGES, who were a great and extensive nation even as early as the time of Hannibal, when they occupied nearly the whole of Dauphiné and the greater part of Savoy. They allied themselves with Hannibal, and vigorously opposed the Romans in the wars of Fabius Allobrogicus and Domitius, but were overpowered; they were, however, not subdued until the war which immediately followed that of Sulla; their complete subjugation cannot be assigned to an earlier period than that of Caesar, for at

the time of the Catilinarian conspiracy it was, properly speaking, not yet complete.

VIENNA was no doubt a capital even in the time of Hannibal; under the emperors it was a very important town.

LUGDUNUM, at the confluence of the Arar (Saone) and the Rhodanus, was a colony founded by Munatius Plancus in the earliest part of the reign of Augustus. It may have been a Gallic town before, otherwise it would scarcely have received a Gallic name; and this supposition quite agrees with the system of the ancients, to found colonies in places already existing as towns. Ancient Lugdunum was very small in comparison with the modern Lyons; but it afterwards became the residence of the Roman governor of the provincia Lugdunensis.

The country north of Lyons between mount Jura and the Cevennes was inhabited by three tribes. The *Arverni*, the westernmost of them, occupied the very heart and centre of Gaul, so far as height and ramification of the mountains are concerned. That district exhibits traces of an immense volcanic activity at some remote period. On the north-east of the Arverni, we have the *Aedui* (not *Haedui*), in Bourgogne, and the *Sequani* in Franche Comté. In the seventh century of Rome, these three nations were the most powerful in Gaul; and the Arverni and Aedui were contending for the supremacy. The Arverni and Allobroges were allied, and Q. Fabius and Cn. Domitius, who carried on war against them, broke the power of both in two campaigns. The Arverni, like all Gallic tribes, are said to have had kings, and names of kings occur on their barbarous coins; according to some accounts which must probably be traced to Posidonius, their power was very great. After the war of Fabius and Domitius, the greatness of the Arverni was completely gone; in the wars of Caesar, they act a very subordinate part, and when the Aedui, their former rivals, were humbled, the Arverni displayed a malicious satisfaction. During the latest period of the

Roman empire, however, they again rose to a certain moral importance: when the Visigoths settled in Languedoc and made Toulouse the residence of their kings, when the Burgundians and other tribes advanced from the east, when northern Gaul was isolated from Spain and Italy, and when the war extended from the north-west to the Rhone, the Arverni, who now regarded themselves as Romans, and felt the greatest aversion against the barbarians, distinguished themselves by their manly and heroic resistance to the hostile conquerors. They were indeed ceded to the Goths, but the barbarians did not settle among them, as they had done in other countries by force of arms. The country of the Arverni is called by Gregory of Tours that of the *Romana nobilitas*. Sidonius Apollinaris does the greatest honour to his province.

The *Aedui* are termed *fratres populi Romani* as a recognition of their political fraternity and equality, but not on account of any relationship, as Lucan thinks. *Augustodunum* was their most important town.

The *Sequani* rose after the fall of the Arverni, just as the Boeotians and Aetolians did in Greece after the decay of the great states. When Caesar arrived in Gaul, his conquest averted from the country the calamity which, four centuries and a half later, actually came upon it, I allude to its conquest by the Germans; for Ariovistus and the Suevi had already settled in the country, as was afterwards done by the Franks: if the first conquest had succeeded, the country would have been called Suabia instead of France. Caesar subdued the Sequani.

Tolosa, on the left of the Arverni, was the most important town on the upper Garonne, and was remarkable for the temple and the gold accumulated in it, which the Romans, under Caepio, had taken as booty in the Cimbrian war. When Caesar appeared there, the people were already subject to the Romans.

The real *Aquitanians*, as I have already observed, were Iberians; but Augustus extended Aquitania for political

convenience as far as the Loire; historically it did not extend beyond the Garonne.

Burdigala was an ancient emporium. These towns were always favoured by the natural advantages of their situation.

According to Caesar, the *Matrona* and *Sequana* formed the frontier between Celtic Gaul and the Belgae. This is generally understood, as if those rivers had always been the permanent line of separation between the two nations, but if this had been the case, we should not be able to understand how the inhabitants of Lower Britany could be of the same race as the Belgae. In order to account for this fact, people have had recourse to an immigration, and it is alleged that, owing to the influx of Angli, Saxons, and Frisians into Britain, a part of the British population quitted their native island and settled in Lower Britany. But this alleged colony of Britons is not supported by any historical evidence; the writers of the fifth century say nothing about it, and what they do say, does not refer to an immigration, but to the fact that a part of Armorica, in the fifth century, made itself independent of Rome. We may assert, on the contrary, that, at an earlier period, the Cymri inhabited a much greater part of Gaul, and that in Lower Britany alone they maintained themselves against the invading Celts, while Normandy and the other countries were conquered by the Gael. The physical nature of Lower Britany also was favourable to its isolation; marshes and forests render it inaccessible, whence the inhabitants also remained free from Roman contagion. In this manner, the Cymrian element was preserved against the influence of the Gauls.

In the fourth and fifth centuries, the northern coast from the Loire to the frontier of the Netherlands, was called *Tractus Aremoricus* or *Aremorica* which in Celtic signifies "maritime country." The commotions of the third century, which continued to increase during the fourth and fifth, repeatedly drove the Romans from that country. French

antiquaries imagine that it was a regularly constituted Gallic republic, of which Chlovis had the protectorate, but this is wrong.

The country north of the Matrona and Sequana was inhabited by the BELGAE, who belonged to the race of the Cymri, and were mixed with Germans only accidentally, because conquered Germans lived among them. The *Remi*, with their capital of *Durocortorum*, were the most distinguished tribe among them in the time of Caesar, and they continued to be great for a long time after, although during the Roman wars they had, properly speaking, fallen from their height. The frontier between the Belgae and Germany is involved in much obscurity; in regard to many tribes, such as the Menapii, it is even doubtful as to whether they were Germans or Cymri. The *Treviri*, according to Tacitus, were *ambitiosi circa Germanicam originem*. On the whole, it would seem that eighteen or nineteen hundred years ago the frontier of the Germans was pretty much the same as it is now. Alsace was occupied by Germans, and the Vosges mountains, and the modern Walloon district about Liege probably formed the boundary. It is possible that at a later period Brabant and Flanders were still Cymric, but nothing decisive can be said about this.[1]

The German nations were divided, in the Roman administration into two great parts, *Germania prima* and *secunda*, which were connected with Gaul only on account of the general government, but were not included by the Romans in the name of Gaul; and at a later time, they were politically separated, because they were under a military government.

Treves was the capital of these parts; in Tacitus it is still called TREVIRI, but afterwards AUGUSTA TREVIRORUM. Ever since the third century, it was probably a considerable city, though not in its circumference, which

[1] The restoration of the text here is uncertain, for towards the end of these Lectures the number of MSS. becomes smaller and smaller, and some of the best do not contain the last Lectures at all.—ED.

people generally are inclined to make much too large; it does not appear to have been much greater than that of its present walls, which, however, is not inconsiderable, if the place was well peopled. The amphitheatre was no doubt outside the walls, as in all Roman towns, except Rome itself. The greatness of Treves extends from the middle of the third to the fifth century; the architectural remains, as is evident from their style, belong to that period. It is the period after Maximinus, or somewhat later, after Valerian, when the barbarians advanced on all sides; the Gallic emperors resided at Treves.

COLONIA AGRIPPINA (Cologne) was less important; it was a frontier fortress and a prosperous colony; but by no means of the importance of Treves.

Traces of Roman settlements are particularly numerous in upper Alsace. *Germania prima* and *secunda* were not confined to the left bank of the Rhine: in the reign of Trajan, the Romans had extended the frontier to the line marked by the *limes* running through a part of Nassau, across the Maine, and as far as the Alps. This *sinus imperii* did not form a separate province, but belonged to Germania on the left bank of the Rhine, being one of those *provinciae Germaniae*, which had their own *praesides*. It was, on the whole, a favourite practice at that time to divide the power among several magistrates.

BRITANNIA.

Britain was known in the most remote times; but its name does not occur until the Macedonian period; it was previously designated by the name of *Cassiterides insulae*. The tin trade can be traced to a very early period; for the first attempts to smelt copper were made by mixing it with tin.

The brass of the ancients, the real χαλκός, consisted for the most part of tin, and all the ancient Roman ases consist of copper and tin. Ὀρείχαλκος, from ὀρεύς, a mule, is something different (Messing), and the spuriousness of the mixture is indicated even by its name. A plentiful supply of tin is not found in any part of Europe, except Cornwall, whence it is quite certain that the name Cassiterides refers to Britain. The trade in it was carried on from Gades; but the Massilians had, no doubt, their share in it, as we may infer from the voyages of Pytheas. In the geography of Eratosthenes, the British islands are already mentioned in the plural; but before the time of Caesar, this part of the world was buried in great obscurity.

Britain, like Gaul, was inhabited by the two nations, the Gael and the Cymri; but it is very difficult and problematical to draw the boundary line between the two. The north seems originally to have been occupied by Cymri, though, according to Tacitus, who in this matter also is a weighty authority, apparently with an admixture of Germans or Scandinavians. At present, the inhabitants in the west, from Cumberland down to Cornwall, so far as the ancient population is preserved, are Cymri; but we do not know whether these Cymri retreated to those parts during the conquests of the Angli and Saxons, or whether they had dwelt there even before. In Ireland nearly the whole population is Gaelic; the north, about Ulster, contains only feeble traces of Belgae or Cymri, and if this observation be correct, it is a proof of a conquest having taken place. From Ireland the Gaelic population spread into Scotland, but it is uncertain whether in this latter country they strengthened the Gael who already dwelt there, or whether they expelled tribes of the Cymri. These events belong to a comparatively recent period. The Picts, in the south-west of Scotland, unquestionably belonged to the Cymrian race.

All Britain, like the country on the east of the British Channel, was inhabited by a number of small tribes, each of which had its own peculiar institutions. But they were much

more uncivilised than those in Gaul, which had unquestionably been much benefited by their intercourse with Massilia and Rome. The conquest of Britain was attempted by Julius Caesar from a mere love of enterprise, and without any definite object, but he soon gave it up. Under Augustus the Romans were little concerned about Britain, and Tiberius only wanted stillness and stagnation, whence his generals could not attempt any great undertakings: he scarcely allowed them to defend themselves when they were hard pressed. This state of things ceased under Claudius, who undertook an expedition into Britain without Rome having any real interest in it. The conquest was wonderfully successful: a great part of England was subdued, and colonies were established in the country. A part of the inhabitants soon became Romanised, built towns according to the Roman fashion, and obtained the Roman franchise. Under Domitian, Agricola carried his conquests as far as the interior of Scotland. The hostility of the Picts induced Hadrian, and afterwards Severus, to build frontier walls against the northern tribes. Britain soon acquired the appearance of a civilised country, but the Romans did not concern themselves about Ireland. In the third century, Britain also acquired a kind of political importance, but it always remained subordinate to Gaul. Afterwards, during the invasions from the north, the inhabitants shewed great weakness and helplessness and were unable to defend their frontier walls. In no part of Europe has the ancient population been so utterly annihilated as in the eastern parts of England by the conquest of the Saxons.

The towns in Britain are not of any great historical importance; *Camalodunum* alone ought perhaps to be mentioned. *London* shows how successful the Romans were in selecting sites for towns. Tacitus, when speaking of the people in the south-west of England, says that they resembled the Spaniards, and he suspects that they were of Spanish origin. It is not impossible that Iberians may have spread as far as those districts, but whether there be any foundation for this

opinion or not cannot be decided, for all historical traces are lost. It is possible, however, that there may have been a tradition, that the Gauls, who had conquered the north of Spain, were afterwards expelled from it; in this case we should be obliged to suppose that the Gauls, when driven out of Spain, arrived in Britain by sea. With few exceptions, all the stories of the middle ages relating to ancient times are devoid of historical value. The tradition of Irish chronicles—that their ancestors came from Spain—though it is interwoven with a tissue of fables, may yet not be altogether without some foundation. In the British legends, on the other hand, there occur stories, as if in the time of the Romans the country had been governed by native kings. English antiquaries, attaching too much weight to these stories, have imagined that Britain was a kind of feudal kingdom under the supremacy of Rome, whereas, in truth, it was governed like every other province.

Celtic Nations on the East of the Rhine.

In order to complete the account of the Gallic race, let us turn our attention to the eastern banks of the Rhine. Caesar and Tacitus speak of Gauls dwelling in southern Germany, and expressly state that they spoke Gallic. One of these nations is the *Aravisci;* another the *Boii*, probably in Bohemia, but elsewhere also. These Boians appear as a great people on the Danube as well as in Italy, whereas in Gaul itself there are but few traces of them. No one can deny emigration in this instance, where a nation diverges in two opposite directions, the one dwelling on the north, and the other on the south of the Alps. The Boians were afterwards extirpated, and that probably by the Cymri. The *Norici* in Carniola and Carinthia, are likewise

mentioned as Gauls under Gallic kings; after the period of the Hannibalian war, about the time of the foundation of Aquileia, they were on terms of friendship with the Romans. They occupied the country from the frontiers of Italy as far as the Danube, but were not connected on their Italian frontier with the other Gallic tribes, being separated from them by the Raetians and Vindelicians. In the east, however, they were connected with a succession of Gallic tribes, and probably in the west also, that is, in the north of the Vindelicians and of the Danube. The *Vindelici* were a Liburnian people, north of the Raetians at the foot of the Brenner, and probably in Bavaria also; but their frontier on the northern slope of the Alps and farther towards the Danube cannot be defined. In the east of the Norici, we find the *Taurisci*, and further on, the *Scordisci*, both terrible nations, which for two centuries (down to the seventh century of Rome) spread terror far and wide among the nations of those parts. The Scordiscans were extirpated by the Romans in an internecine war, or at least so much reduced that afterwards the Getae completely annihilated them: in the first century after Christ, they can scarcely be said to have existed at all. These nations appear in those countries at a time of which Caesar speaks as of a bygone age, that is, about Olymp. 100, soon after the Gauls had taken possession of Gallia Cisalpina. • The time at which the tide of migration from the west crossed the Rhine, cannot be determined, but after it had once commenced it continued to flow to far distant countries in the east. Some of the tribes established themselves in the districts they had conquered, while others pressed onward, until they met with some insurmountable obstacle. The Tauriscans and Scordiscans displaced the Triballians, and extirpated the greater part of the Illyrians, while they subdued the rest; for a period of two centuries they then ruled over those countries as far as the frontiers of Macedonia, and at times over Macedonia itself; afterwards, when Rome had destroyed the kingdom of Macedonia, they even invaded Greece. About the end

of the fifth century of Rome, they dwelt for a time in Macedonia, until they were expelled by Antigonus Gonatas. In like manner they subdued Thrace, which thus was a Gallic empire until the middle of the sixth century of Rome, when it was completely destroyed. All the foreign tribes which we meet with in Asia Minor, and which for a period of fifty years traversed Western Asia like nomades, belong to the same current of migration which left behind the Tauriscans and Scordiscans, and overran Thrace; they threw themselves into Asia, and settling in Phrygia, there formed what was afterwards called *Galatia*. They were gradually tamed by the kings of Pergamus, by time, and by the Asiatic climate and mode of life. After the war with Antiochus, the Romans took the opportunity to attack them for the purpose of protecting the people of Western Asia and of preventing any germs of development being formed there. Now whether the Gauls whom we afterwards meet with on the north bank of the Danube, were a branch of that great current, which in its onward course became divided, turning on the right into Thrace, and on the left into Wallachia, is a question concerning which we can only form conjectures. It certainly is possible: but it is also possible that another migration may have spread in the north of the Carpathians. But it is an undoubted fact, that, during the sixth century of Rome, at the time of the wars of Philip and Perseus, the great nation of the *Bastarnae* dwelt on the lower Danube and in Wallachia. From the monuments of Olbia, in the neighbourhood of the modern Odessa, on the Dniepr, it is manifest that at the time when the great inscription was set up, Olbia was inhabited by Gauls; and among them are mentioned the *Sciri*, who afterwards, during the great migration of nations, are spoken of along with the Rugians. Unfortunately the inscription bears no date, though it probably belongs to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century of Rome: at that time, then, the Gauls extended as far as the Ukraine. The first thirty years of the seventh century must be regarded

as the end of that migration; hence the expedition of the Cimbri, that is, Cymri, belongs to that period, for most of those Gallic tribes were, no doubt, Cymri, and the names of their chiefs are Cymric. This supposition also agrees with the account of Posidonius, that the Cimbri (Cymri) came from the Euxine.[1] The Bastarnae remained in the country about the Carpathians until the time of Tacitus, and maintained themselves against the Sarmatian immigration, which first set the Cymri in motion. I have written a separate treatise on the migration of the Sarmatians.[2] In Herodotus we find the Scythians on the Tanais as far as the Banat, all Moldavia and Wallachia was occupied by them, and the Triballians are found in Lower Hungary; but, afterwards, the latter occur in Moldavia, the Getae in Wallachia, and the Celts between these two. The different periods, therefore, must be carefully distinguished.

Johannes Müller was the first to propound the correct view about the Cimbri, maintaining that they were not Germans, but Celts, and that they did not come from the north. The work in which he proves this was his earliest production, and at the same time his most critical one, but he does not understand the nature of the Gallic migration. The Teutones were unquestionably Germans.

[1] "The *Cimmerians* on the Euxine cannot be connected with these occurrences, for they belong to a period about two centuries earlier than that at which the Cymri can possibly have arrived in those parts."

[2] *Kleine Schrift*, vol. i. p. 352, foll.

AFRICA.

CYRENAICA.

THE coast of Libya between the Syrtes and Egypt, both begins and ends with a narrow, inhabitable, and yet barren tract of land; but in the middle, where the country reaches the northernmost parallel, it is beautiful, inhabited, and of considerable breadth. The eastern coast of the Syrtes is a complete sandy desert, still, however, not so much so as to be totally uninhabitable; towards Egypt, the country is stony, dry, and incapable of cultivation. But between Berenice and a little to the east of Cyrene, it is beautiful, richly watered, and fertile. The whole forms a slope; the interior of Africa is considerably elevated, and the desert, too, where it is removed from the coast, is high, while towards the coast the land sinks down; only the tract on which Cyrene is situated, forms another table-land rich in wood and springs of water. From Cyrene downwards to the sea, the country is likewise well watered and capable of cultivation. The elevation of Cyrene is so considerable, that the harvest time differs by a full month from that in the lower country. The coast, however, is not so beautiful nor so well fitted to be inhabited as the higher country.

CYRENE is situated at a distance of about ten English miles from the sea, but the beautiful country extends much farther into the interior; in the neighbourhood of Barca and

Berenice, the fertile country is less broad. There are different traditions about the first settlement at Cyrene; according to one, the town was founded by Aristaeus and his mother Cyrene, and according to another by the Antenorids. This we learn from Pindar's epinician hymns and his scholiasts; and these statements clearly show, that either a Tyrrheno-Pelasgian settlement existed there before the arrival of the Greeks, or at least that there was a belief that the coast had previously been inhabited by Pelasgians. Confusions, like that of Aristaeus with the Trojan Agenorids, also occur among other nations, among whom Tyrrhenian traditions existed. These legends, moreover, show different phases: according to one, the colonists who founded Cyrene came from Thera, whereas, according to Apollonius Rhodius, in his Argonautics, Triton, the Libyan god of the sea, gave to the Argonauts a clod of earth, which, on being thrown by them into the sea, formed the island of Thera. Here, then, we have again the same fluctuation as to mother-city and colony, which we have seen so often. Afterwards Cyrene was Doric, and unquestionably a colony of Thera. It was originally a small settlement, but during the period of the great commotion in Greece, about Olymp. 40, people from all parts of Greece flocked to Cyrene, being invited to defend the colony against the Libyans. Cyrene thus became great, and acquired the circumference which is still indicated by its magnificent ruins. Its kings traced their origin to the heroic ages, and are mentioned in history down to the Persian period, after which they disappear. The isolated situation of Cyrene was extremely fortunate, and few Greek cities have been visited by so few great calamities as Cyrene. When the Persians ruled in Egypt, Cyrene was little more than nominally dependent, for the deserts by which it was separated from Egypt, afforded it the means of putting itself in a favourable relation to Persia. When Egypt was governed by native kings, Cyrene was doubly well off, because it was for the interest of the Egyptians to keep up

a good understanding with the Greeks. At the time of the overthrow of the Persian empire, Cyrene placed itself under the protection of Alexander; afterwards it fell into the hands of Magas, a half-brother of Ptolemy Soter, under whom the country became very prosperous, because Greeks and Greek civilisation withdrew to that coast. It then was for a time an Egyptian province, but again emancipated itself; on which occasion it was severely ravaged. Afterwards it became an appanage principality of the family of the Ptolemies, until in the end it came under the dominion of Rome, under whose rule it gradually decayed. In the history of Hadrian, we hear of the subjugation of rebellious Jews in Cyprus and Cyrenaica, which may have been one of the more immediate causes of the decay of Cyrene, so that in the time of Synesius it appears as a deserted, inactive, and insignificant place. Greek civilisation, however, maintained itself there for a long time, as we see from the letters of Synesius, the talented bishop of Cyrene in the fifth century. The city was at last destroyed during the Arab conquest, and has never recovered since that time. At present it is in a condition like that of Palmyra: the wandering Arabs encamp among the ruins of its temples, and the few peasants living in the neighbourhood destroy the monuments still more.

BERENICE is the westernmost place on the same coast. Three towns, Berenice, Arsinoe, and Ptolemais, derived their names from members of the royal family of Egypt. Berenice was a newly-built town, situated on the frontier towards Carthage. At present not a trace of it remains, but the ruins of ARSINOE, or Tauchira, are very numerous. According to the description of Della Cella, a Genoese physician, the walls measure three Italian miles in circumference, and are covered all over with inscriptions. The most ample materials for history might be discovered there. The origin of the town is unknown.

BARCA, founded in the reign of the third Arcesilaus, was an *ἀποδασμὸς* of the Cyreneans, and for a long time hostile

to Cyrene. Afterwards its name was changed into *Ptolemais*, and it is still called *Tolometa*, which arose out of *Ptolemaide*.

Apollonia was the port town of Cyrene.

On the west, Cyrene bordered upon the great republic of

CARTHAGE.

The frontier between these two states was as natural as any can be between two countries. The whole district from the bay of the lesser Syrtis, or the country of Tripoli, is a deep sandy desert, of which only a few parts, the neighbourhood of Tripoli, and the ancient Leptis, are capable of cultivation. But agriculture there being limited to sandy districts, produces nothing but *durra*, the African millet, and palm trees, which succeed in sandy ground, if it is well watered. The desert advances close to the coast, and the inhabitable coast tract is interrupted and unequal. On the east of Leptis, where the desert retreats farther into the interior and around the great Syrtis, the country forms a real sea of sand, which is far more dangerous than the Sahara, where the ground is for the most part firm; on this Syrtis, on the other hand, persons sink deep into the sand at every step.

On the frontier there were boundary marks, called *Arae Philaenorum*. The tradition about them was as follows:—Once the Cyreneans and Carthaginians being involved in a dispute about their frontiers, determined to send out men from the two extreme towns of their countries at the same moment, agreeing that the point of their meeting should be the frontier. This tradition is probably an invention, like so many other things which Sallust relates from Punic authorities. The SYRTES are generally described by the ancients, especially by the earlier Greeks, as one only. The Syrtis, they say, has tides, and is a bay full of sand-banks, which are

sometimes sufficiently covered with water and sometimes rise above the water like lagoons. The existence of tides in the Mediterranean has, until recently, been denied, and all the statements of the ancients regarding them have been rejected, as in general ancient geography, about thirty or forty years ago, was treated with extreme recklessness. Tides do exist beyond all doubt, but they occur in a very irregular and unaccountable manner. They are very unequal: at Venice you may see it every day, and during a spring tide, the water rises as much as one foot and a half; it also exists in the Archipelago and in the Euripus near Chalcis, where it comes from the north, which has given rise to the story about the death of Aristotle.[1] It is said, that at Naples the tides are not perceptible, but that at Antium they are, especially when there is a spring tide. The peculiarity of the Syrtes, which the ancients asserted, and which moderns have denied, is that a current runs into the Syrtes and thus throws vessels on the sand-banks. This arises from the meetings of two currents, one of which comes from the Adriatic and the other from the Aegean; the one coming from the Euxine encounters that coming from the Ionian sea, and moves round in a curve, as in general all currents of the sea move in curves. We cannot wonder, therefore, that during a north-west wind, ships, sailing from Sicily to the Archipelago, were thrown into the Syrtes: the danger was, of course, much greater for the ancients than for us. The countries round the Syrtes are the most wretched and melancholy districts of all the inhabited parts of the earth; they are worse than the desert itself, except that water is not wanting for so long a period as in the desert. The caravans dig wells, but the water is bad.

The whole of the western part of the north coast of Africa, of which Carthage is the central point, was once

[1] According to some of the Fathers, he threw himself into the Euripus, because he had been unable to discover the law by which the currents of the sea were regulated.—Ed.

under the dominion of Carthage, from the Syrtes to the straits of Gibraltar, though that dominion was not the same everywhere. The modern Algiers and Morocco contain no traces of Carthaginian colonies; there existed in those parts nothing but Carthaginian forts and factories for commercial purposes; but Tunis and Tripoli, that is, the whole coast from Hippo to Leptis, was covered with Punic towns. Some of them were more ancient than Carthage (which was for this reason called "New Town"); Utica, Hippo, Leptis, and perhaps also Hadrumetum, and others whose names can no longer be ascertained, were, like Gades, direct colonies of Tyre and Sidon in Phoenicia, and had been founded at the time when so many Phoenician settlements were formed on the coasts of Greece, in the islands of the Archipelago, and in Cyprus. It was during that period of the greatness of Phoenicia, which lies beyond our history, that numerous colonies were established on the coast of Africa. We do not know what circumstances directed the attention to those parts, for the Libyans were a great people. The nature of the country is very different in different parts: Tripoli (which is inhabitable from the head of the lesser to the greater Syrtis), is the foreland of the desert, while Tunis is much more fertile. Here the northern chain of mount Atlas terminates; and the western part of Tunis is a mountainous, beautiful, and fertile country. One range of the mountain extends as far as the sea, forming a hilly country, with the beautiful promontory and the bay of Carthage. The territory from this promontory as far as the Syrtes is, according to all descriptions, one of the most fertile countries, though the district in which Carthage was situated was less healthy and of a less agreeable climate. *Byzacene*, or the eastern coast of Tunis, on the other hand, is very healthy, and has no overpowering heat, except in rare cases when the poisonous wind blows from the desert; this wind is much more frequent at Carthage and its neighbourhood.

This coast, then, was thickly studded with towns, the

more ancient ones were Tyrian, and the more recent ones Carthaginian settlements. The inhabitants of the latter are called *Libyphoenices*, whence, from their very name, we cannot suppose that they were of pure Punic blood: they were Punians who had admitted Africans among them, and their language was a corrupt Punic. The Carthaginians were greatly inclined to mix with, and admit other tribes, which accounts for the fact of their language being so widely spread: all the civilisation adopted by the Africans was Punic. The Carthaginians had a peculiar Libyan alphabet, and when the writing of the Tuariks is once discovered, I hope the Carthaginian inscriptions also will be deciphered. Their literature, however, was Punic. The Romans gave the library of Carthage as a present to the kings of Numidia; that library contained the native historical records of Africa, from which such singular statements were extracted by Sallust in composing his Jugurtha, and the key to which must still be discovered: they did not contain real history, but we can see from them in what light those nations regarded their history.

The language of the original inhabitants of northern Africa was perhaps more widely spread than any other: this is the language of the Berbers, which was once spoken from the Canary islands in the west to the cataracts of the Nile, and in some parts it is spoken even at the present day. It is singular that the nation speaking that language embraced tribes of quite different physical characters, whites as well as blacks (though not negroes); the ancients, in fact, distinguish between Gaetulians and Melanogaetulians, though they regard them as one nation. Harsh rudeness was a generally prevailing characteristic of the nation, but in proportion to the extent of country occupied by it, it was not numerous; at present their descendants occur only in the oases of the desert, while formerly they extended from the Mediterranean to the banks of the Niger; on the coast they have nearly everywhere been displaced by the Arabs, who are still gaining ground, so that now they are found

only in some parts of Algiers and Morocco. The Romans called them *Afri*, and the Greeks, *Λίβυες*; it has been supposed that the latter name is connected with that of Levante or Leguante. The name by which the nation designates itself, viz., Amazirgh, Mazirgh, or Mzirgh, is found, according to an observation of Castiglione, even in Herodotus, who speaks of *Μάσυες*; this is the correct form occurring in the MSS., instead of which the printed editions erroneously give *Μάξυες*. The name *Massaesyli*, which was given to the western Libyans between the lesser Syrtis and the Ocean, also is nothing but Mazirgh Shilha, for they also call themselves Shilhas. The eastern tribes are called *Massyli*, which is the same as *Μάσυες*, for the termination *yli* seems to be the common Italian one, which we find in *Aequuli* for *Aequi*. The Carthaginians probably called them by this name. The bilingual inscriptions, which exist in considerable numbers, would throw more light upon the language of those countries, if they were deciphered, and they may possibly contain the key by which the Punic inscriptions also are to be explained.

It is singular that the Romans called those nations *Numidae*, which is not a proper name, but a common noun. The Greek form was *νομάδες*, and from this the Romans made *Numidae*, a circumstance which shows to what extent Greek words were in common use among the Romans. Afterwards *Numida* and *Numidia* became names of the nation and the country, so that, no doubt, Masinissa called himself king of Numidia. These tribes extended from the boundary of the Carthaginian territory to the river Molochath (Mulucha), which still may be regarded as the frontier of Algiers. We must not, however, suppose that the country beyond that river was occupied by a different race, for it was only another tribe of the same stock. These latter were called *Mauri* (*Μαυροὶ*, Blacks, in the Alexandrian dialect), a name which became as firmly established for the western tribes as Numidae was for the eastern ones. The country in the south, between Mount Atlas and the Sahara,

as far as the Niger, was inhabited by the *Gaetuli* and *Melanogaetuli*, the modern Tuariks. The Melanogaetuli were unquestionably of the same race as the Gaetuli, but had no doubt arisen from a mixture with the Aethiopians, who dwelt there. They were accordingly a dark mixed race like that at present in Darfoor. We do not know by what name they called themselves.

The *Garamantes* are placed too far to the south-east in our maps; they were the inhabitants of the modern Fezzan, and the present town of Germa was their capital, where Roman inscriptions are still found among the ruins. The dominion of the Romans in those parts, about which nothing is said by ancient geographers, belongs to the second century, when they extended their power in different directions, for under Trajan they entered far into the interior of Arabia, and in Nubia they advanced as far as Dongola, the surrounding tribes being too weak to offer effectual resistance. The distance between Tripoli and Fezzan is about forty days' journey. The town of *Augila*, mentioned by Herodotus, in the country of the Nasamones, is called to this day Audyeelah or Eudyeelah; the name of the Nasamones themselves has not yet been re-discovered. Count Castiglione has written a very beautiful essay on those countries in the form of an appendix to his work entitled "Les Monnaies des Arabes frappées en Afrique."

Herodotus divides Africa into four parts, the agricultural, the mountainous, the country of beasts of prey, and the desert. Beyond the river, Nigritae also are mentioned, but we must not imagine that either this name or that of the river Niger has anything to do with *niger*, black; it is the Punic *nahar* which signifies "a river," and shows the intercourse of the Carthaginians with those countries. The same fact has also been confirmed by the discovery of balls and staves of glass of exquisite beauty in those parts. The art of treating glass in such a manner as to include in a white glass a number of flowers, balls, and other objects, without injuring the outlines, is assuredly of Phoenician

origin, and at present quite unknown. Some specimens of such glass are found in Italy, where it was partly employed to ornament rooms, and quite a similar piece of glasswork has been discovered in the tomb of a negro king in Guinea, whither it had evidently been exported from Carthage. Such pieces are said to have been used as ornaments for victors, and there is even a tradition among the negroes, that these glass ornaments have from time immemorial belonged to their sceptres. Servius states, that the Romans gave to the chiefs of the Berbers ornamented sticks instead of sceptres; the same custom still exists, but the sticks are not adorned with silver.

The name *Marmarica* is derived from *mar*, salt, with a reduplication very frequent in those languages.

Among all the settlements on that Coast, CARTHAGE is by far the most illustrious. The situation and greatness of the city are described in the later excerpts from Diodorus of Sicily, in Strabo, and in Appian's Punica. One point, however, must not be lost sight of in these descriptions, viz., the ancients assume that Carthage covered the peninsula which was connected with the mainland by the isthmus, and that the isthmus was cut off by means of a wall. But the fact is, that the whole of the peninsula was not occupied by the city, which, in that case, would have been immensely large. M. Humbert, a Dutch lieutenant, who was long engaged in the service of the pasha of Tunis, and was a good observer, discovered during his excavations, some years ago, the ruins of ancient Carthage and the walls by which it was surrounded. He made an excellent ground plan of those remains, which, however, has never been published, but exists only in MS. According to this plan, the peninsula contained two towns, the ancient Punic Carthage on the south side, perhaps not occupying one-half of the peninsula, and Roman Carthage on the other side towards Rome, which had been built by J. Caesar: lying under the curse of Scipio, the site of the ancient city could not be occupied by a new town. The remains of Roman

Carthage are far more numerous than those of the more ancient city; the little that is to be seen of the latter consists of gigantic works about the harbour (Cothon).

Ancient Carthage consisted of two parts, viz., the city called *Bozra* (the Greeks call it *Βύρσα*), and the suburb *Megara*, the Punic name of which was probably Magal. The remaining part of the peninsula may have been included under this name. These suburban districts were protected against the attacks of the barbarous Libyans by walls across the isthmus.[1] We must not imagine that there was a separate acra besides Byrsa, the elevation of which is insignificant, only the point containing the temple of Aesculapius may perhaps be compared to a real acra. According to Timaeus, Carthage was built thirty-seven[2] years before the commencement of the Olympiads; this may be regarded as a settled date, as we see from the work of Josephus against Apion, for the Phoenician authorities, which he followed, are thoroughly trustworthy, and perfectly agree with the books of Samuel and Kings in the Old Testament. The books of Judges are of later origin, and contain chronological impossibilities; but from the time of David we have contemporary and quite trustworthy history; some few erroneous dates are probably mere slips in writing. In the reigns of Manasseh and Amon there are a few incorrect statements, and I have shown where the mistake of from twenty to thirty years is probably concealed,[3] but I cannot say how the text is to be emended. After the first three centuries, Carthage had already acquired many possessions in Byzacene, that is, the country from the headland on the bay to the lesser Syrtis; in Sardinia, too, it exercised a powerful influence, and some Punic settlements already existed in Spain. But not long before that time, Carthage was still engaged in deadly war with the Libyans, and its rule

[1] One MS. here has the addition "As Constantinople is by the wall S. Floriano." Should it not be S. Romano?—ED.

[2] Should be thirty-eight; see *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 271.

[3] *Kleine Schrfit.*, vol. i p. 209, note.

certainly did not extend to the interior of Africa. The real greatness of the city lasted about 150 years, from about the close of the Peloponnesian to the commencement of the first Punic war.

UTICA (Atica, the Old Town, as opposed to Carthage, or New Town) was situated not far from Carthage. The simplicity and constant repetition of the Phoenician names show the want of poetry in that nation; the Greeks have an endless variety of names. *Utica* and *Hippo* are the two old towns on that coast; they were more ancient than Carthage, and independent of it, being sometimes even allied with it on equal terms. This honour they retained until the second Punic war; they also concluded treaties with full independence, but were virtually subject to Carthage. Hence in the war of Agathocles, both declared in his favour, and in the same manner they acted in the war of the mercenaries, until, in the end, they separated themselves entirely and joined the Romans, whence, notwithstanding their Punic origin, they remained *civitates foederatae*. It is interesting to observe, how easily Greek culture was engrafted upon those Punians; the Carthaginian senate, on one occasion, found it necessary to enact a law against it,[1] and at times Utica had a theatre, in which Greek plays, translated into Punic, were performed. Both St. Augustin and Apuleius (the latter was a native of Madaura in the interior) spoke Punic as their mother tongue, whence we see that the people throughout the province of Carthage spoke Punic, and that the language of the Amazirghs had become extinct. In some parts of the coast, Latin was spoken. When the Arabs conquered the country, the inhabitants still employed the Punic language, and the adoption of the Arabic was facilitated by the kindred nature of the two languages. The foreign elements in the languages of Tunis and Malta are probably derived from that of the Amazirghs; Latin also is mixed up with them.

The coast of *Byzacene* is one of the most fertile in the

[1] Justin, xx. 5.

world: the olive-tree, which is one of the richest blessings of the temperate zone, was, strange to say, not introduced into those parts until a late period, and that district is the only one in which the palm and the olive-tree grow side by side. In the earlier times, Carthage obtained its oil from Greece and Italy. The coast was studded with towns, just like the country of Cyrene. Notwithstanding the destruction of Carthage, those countries were perhaps never so well cultivated and so thickly peopled as under the Roman emperors, especially in the reign of Severus, as is attested by Tertullian, a contemporary writer, and by the immense number of ruins in the territory of Tunis.

Zeugitana is the basin of the bay of Tunis. The southern part of the eastern coast of Tunis was called *Byzacion*, *Byzacene* or *Byzacitis*. *Tunis* deserves to be mentioned among the provincial towns on account of its subsequent importance, of which antiquity knows nothing.

The greater part of the Carthaginian territory was given by the Romans to Masinissa, who, by the most shameless usurpation, and by the support of the most faithless policy on the part of the Romans, endeavoured to make himself master of it; for after the second Punic war, the Carthaginians still possessed an extensive territory. Even before, Numidia had received nearly all the districts which had been conquered in war, such as Zama, and other places.

The Numidian kings resided at CIRTA, that is, "the town," in the Punic language, which is another proof of the poverty of its nomenclature. This town rose to greatness under Masinissa, and still more under Micipsa, who drew into it a Greek colony, just as in the time of Louis XIV, French colonies were established in the north of Germany. The time of that colony belongs to the period in which Corinth was destroyed and the whole of Greece was devastated, and when the poor Greeks were scattered all over the earth. Under Constantine the Great, its name was changed into *Constantina*, and large Roman ruins still exist there. It was a Roman colony founded by P. Sitius of Nuceria,

who assembled an army of Roman fugitives and Gauls that had served under the African princes, and received Cirta from Julius Caesar, after the conquest of Juba, as a place to settle in. It is, therefore, a colony of quite a peculiar kind, differing essentially from all other colonies.

—•—

AETHIOPIA, AEGYPTUS.

The Ethiopians, with the earliest Greeks, are the black people in the south-east and south-west, whence Indians and Ethiopians are synonymous, the southern Indians being black. I believe that the Indian peninsula was conquered by the Indians, and that the black race was subdued by them. Ethiopia, with the Greeks, is only a vague name for Africa. Its derivation from *αἴθω* is erroneous, but it is doubtful whether the nation had any special name by which it designated itself. We must, however, distinguish the *Leucaethiopes*, that is, the Fellatahs, or Fellahs, whom Ptolemy distinctly places on the Senegal, to which locality they are also assigned by the great D'Anville. The name Ethiopians was afterwards limited to the Abyssinian race and the tribes belonging to them, and these latter nations still call their country Ithopya, though we can hardly suppose the name to be of native origin. The excerpts from Agatharchides of Cnidos, a most excellent writer of the seventh century of Rome, who for a long time resided in Egypt, but does not call the nations by their own names, but only by appellatives, are very obscure, and have been entirely neglected. He gives information about nations which are found at present only in the innermost parts of Africa: he describes, e.g., the Hottentots and Bushmen, whom he calls Acridophagi, that is, eaters of grasshoppers, so that even those living in the distant south were noticed

by him. The Hottentots cut out one of their testicles, a fact with which he was acquainted.

Ethiopia proper is highly remarkable in ancient history: in Scripture it is called Koosh, and its kings are distinguished from those of the Mauri. The country of these Mauri was in very ancient times a great state in the south of Egypt; its capital, *Meroe*, contrary to the express testimony of the ancients, has generally been placed too near Egypt; it was probably situated in the neighbourhood of Sennaar. The Meroites had a peculiar kind of civilisation; and there can be no doubt that the hieroglyphics, and all that we afterwards find as Egyptian civilisation, originated among them. At a very remote time they conquered Egypt; the ancients themselves trace to them the knowledge and religion of the Egyptians; they describe their monuments as Ethiopian, and all that can be made out by historical inquiry is confirmatory of this view. The southernmost monuments of Egypt, between the two cataracts, are the grandest and most ancient; then follows Thebes, and as we advance northward, the monuments become smaller and more insignificant. But monuments are found also higher up the river to the south of Meroe. The accounts in Diodorus about the condition of that city are perfectly credible and satisfactory. The Egyptians, like the Celtiberians, Celtoligyans and others, were a mixed people, in which one nation ruled while the other obeyed. In the Greek documents of Egypt, such as contracts, and the like, we find a singular custom, occasioned by the extremely small number of proper names: the notary, in order to prevent confusion, added a description of the persons concerned. Accordingly, we can clearly distinguish the different races, for we find such characteristics as short, yellow, flat nose, curly hair, and the like.[1] The most ancient idols resemble negroes, as, for example, the celebrated Isis of Elephantine. Among the mummies, too, there are a great many negro forms, faces altogether non-European, different both in

[1] Comp. *Lect. on Anc. Hist.* vol. i. p. 46, foll.

their skulls and teeth; and this is another sign that Egypt was conquered by the Ethiopians, who settled among the conquered people. Champollion the younger is not only an honest man, but has no doubt discovered the truth. The most ancient documents we have, go back as far as the eighteenth dynasty of Manetho; and the seventeenth and eighteenth dynasties are probably the period when the yoke of the Hycsos was thrown off in consequence of this conquest. The original inhabitants were probably Libyans, who extended as far as lake Mareotis, for Mareotis is a Libyan name; and Egyptians, in the sense in which Herodotus understands the name, do not occur beyond the Canobian mouth of the Nile. The original inhabitants, therefore, may have been under the dominion of a Semitic race, which among the Egyptians bore the name of Hycsos, and was intensely hated by the later Egyptians. This expulsion of the Hycsos, which is so often represented on monuments, was the result of the establishment of the Kooshites in Upper Egypt, who thence also spread over Lower Egypt. The modern Egyptians have scarcely a trace left of the ancient physiognomy; their features are rather Libyan. The Copts have harsh and rude features, but they are just those of the Berbers, whence they are different from the Arabs and Syrians. The mummies which are brought to Europe belong to the higher castes, descended for the most part from Ethiopians—a race which has now disappeared: the great mass of the nation consisted of natives. The settlement of the Egyptian warriors (*μάχιμοι*) in the south of Meroe, of which Herodotus speaks, is nothing else but another instance of the confusion of the two poles in legends about migrations; arising from the fact that a tribe was found in those southern parts resembling the one ruling in Lower Egypt. The story, as it is related, is only ridiculous. This also accounts for the institution of castes, for wherever they exist they originate in conquest.

Upper and Lower Egypt differ most widely from each

other: the former is a narrow and deep valley, which is but rarely overflowed by the river; Middle Egypt is more frequently exposed to inundations; and Lower Egypt, in antiquity, was put under water by every rising of the Nile; at present it is only the districts between the arms of the river and the neighbourhood of Damietta that are overflowed. This is accounted for by the circumstance that after every inundation the river leaves behind a stratum of mud, whereby the country is constantly raised: on the bank the different years may be traced by very thin strata, a fact which has been unjustly denied. In ancient times, the arms of the Nile were large rivers, while at present ships of some size cannot sail into any of the mouths of the river, because the bed has been so much elevated. But the surrounding country has been raised much more; for in the time of Herodotus all the towns were situated on hills rising above the ground which was usually inundated; but this is not the case now, the lower parts having been filled up, and the extensive marshes in the Delta having, for the most part, become arable land, while the ancient lakes are changed into marshes. Upper Egypt must have been irrigated by artificially raising the water. There is, moreover, this remarkable change in the climate of Egypt, that, while in Herodotus' time it never rained in Upper Egypt, at present there are occasional showers, though never without violent thunderstorms.

THEBES was the ancient capital of Upper Egypt; but it had fallen from its greatness even before the Persian conquest, for Psammetichus, for the sake of commerce, had transferred the capital to Lower Egypt, and he was strong through the support of foreigners. From that time, Thebes was always in opposition to the rulers; it was eclipsed by Memphis, and afterwards by Sais, but it still regarded itself as the repository of ancient wisdom and as the venerable seat of religion. The city was greatly deserted and decayed; but there is no reason for doubting its immense magnitude; its ruins are gigantic, and its temples are as vast

as cities. Thebes received its death-blow during the unfortunate rebellion against Ptolemy Physcon; under the Romans, too, it was frequently the centre of insurrection.

PTOLEMAIS, the next town after Thebes down the river, was founded by the first or second Ptolemy against the seditious disposition of the Thebans; it was a *σύστημα Ἑλληνικὸν* in the proper sense of the term, with Greek institutions, both public and private, and Greek was the language of the place. By means of this city, the Ptolemies endeavoured to keep Upper Egypt in subjection, while, on the other hand, they admitted colonisation to Alexandria for similar purposes, exercising their power from above through a number of local magistrates. In other respects, the Ptolemies did not favour Greek colonisation as much as the Seleucidae, for they confined it to Ptolemais and Alexandria.[1]

MEMPHIS never was comparable to Thebes in size and importance, for it contained only very few large buildings, of which at present no traces exist. All the buildings, such as royal palaces and the like, must have consisted of unburnt bricks. The city was large and populous, but it already represents a different state of things: the transfer of the capital to this place must be regarded as the epoch in which the pyramids were built, that is, as the age of Sesostris. Its citadel is called *λευκὸν τεῖχος* (*arx alba*, *murus albus* is a wrong translation), just as the walls of Moscow had different colours, and as at Ecbatana the parapets of the different circles.[2]

SAIS, a still more recent capital, was built by Psammetichus and his successors, entirely with a view to be near the sea. In its vicinity were the *castra praetoria* of the Ionians and Carians, by the aid of which those kings maintained their dominion.

ALEXANDRIA was, properly speaking, situated beyond the frontiers of Egypt, and it was only on the consideration that water of the Nile from the arm of Canobus flowed into

[1] Comp. *Lect. on Anc. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 298, note 3. [2] Herod. i. 98.

lake Mareotis, that it could be said to belong to Egypt, for it stood in reality on Libyan ground. It had been a much frequented port even in the time of the Egyptian kings, being protected by the island of Pharos at the entrance of it; but the kings kept a garrison there for the purpose of preventing strangers from landing. The place had formerly been called *Rhacotis*. Alexander is justly praised for having perceived the advantages of the locality, which is so well fitted to form a point of communication between Africa, Europe, and Asia: he was not generally very fortunate in his choice of places. Alexandria was probably destined by him to be the capital of his empire, seeing he intended to conquer, at least, the north coast of Africa and southern Italy, and in general all countries so far as he was not checked by the temperate zone and his own ambition. Of the city founded by Alexander, every trace has disappeared, and all that remains belongs to the Roman period. The city rose with wonderful rapidity, and three distinct bodies of citizens were formed in it. The noblest consisted of Macedonians and Greeks, who, like Greek citizens, were divided into phylae and demi. The intention was that it should appear as a free city; and the Macedonians and Greeks were according to all appearance, not kept distinct. The second part, consisting of a numerous Jewish colony, formed a demos, enjoying civil, but no political, rights; these Jews were not allowed to dwell in three out of the five regions into which the city was divided. The third body, which in point of numbers was the largest, consisted of native Egyptians, who, however, were regarded almost as bondsmen, like the Lettonians and Esthonians at Reval and Riga. Cleomenes, by Alexander's command the founder of Alexandria, was a wicked adventurer, but an able man. The city rose greatly even under the first Ptolemy; but it afterwards continued to increase in consequence of its extremely favourable situation. It was the legitimate staple of commerce, which had there its necessary centre; it was almost in the exclusive enjoyment of the

trade with Egypt, Africa, Arabia, and India. Ptolemy Physcon destroyed the greater part of the Macedonian and Greek inhabitants. Caesar's war was very destructive, for the struggle was carried on in the very streets of the city; and from that time the suburb in the island of Pharos remained deserted; at least under Tiberius it still was so. During the empire, Alexandria was the scene of several insurrections; the one occurring in the reign of Diocletian was fearful, but that emperor took such bloody revenge, that the city probably never recovered; and for a century afterwards the whole part called Bruchion was quite uninhabited. D'Anville has made a ground-plan of Alexandria.

The island of *Pharos* was situated in front of the city, and between it and the coast there were excellent places for anchoring, which communicated with one another, but were separated by cliffs. The Ptolemies constructed a causeway across the narrow channel by means of draw-bridges. Thus arose the two harbours, the old and the new one, which are at present separated by a neck of land, but are much inferior to what they were in antiquity; they have been spoiled during a long period of barbarous neglect, and especially by throwing ballast overboard. The ships of the Mahommedans enter only the western port, which is the safer one. The island of Pharos contained the celebrated light-house, one of the improvements of an age in which the feelings and the heart had already become greatly deteriorated, but in which the mechanical arts had made considerable progress. Lucian, who often embellishes history, here also furnishes a story which is as absurd as it well can be. He says that Sostratus of Cnidus built this light-house, and that, against the will of Ptolemy, he caused his own name to be engraved under the inscription in praise of the king.[1] But according to Strabo, Sostratos was the king's minister, and acquired the special favour of his sovereign by building the light-house at his own expense.

[1] Lucian, *Quom. Hist. Conscrib. sit.* 62. "Lucian's story about Herodotus is equally devoid of historical foundation."

The inscription, *Σώστρατος Δεξιφανοῦς Κνίδιος θεοῖς σωτῆρσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν πλωιζομένων* is quite in the style of the time; the *θεοὶ σωτῆρες* are Ptolemy and Berenice. The whole space between the harbour and lake Mareotis was occupied by the city of Alexandria, and in the time of Augustus a large suburb is said to have existed at a distance of thirty stadia from the city, in the direction of Canobus. Alexandria is a classical place in the history of nations and of literature: it was the residence of Eratosthenes, the first geographer we meet with in the history of the world.[1]

NAUCRATIS, below Sais in Lower Egypt, was a Greek settlement, under the supremacy of Egypt, nearly in the same manner in which Macao is a Portuguese town: Greeks dwelt there and had their own magistrate, or, so to speak, their own consul. Many authors are said to have been natives of the place; Phylarchus, e.g., is called Naucratites, but it was mere pedantry and affectation to speak of Naucratis instead of Alexandria as the Greek city.

The Egyptian towns generally had two names, one Egyptian and the other Greek; the native names are preserved in Coptic fragments, and have been made out by Champollion; a map also has been made with these names. The modern names are formed from the Arabic.

SOME MORE GREEK COLONIES.

PHASELIS, on the coast of Lycia, was a Doric colony; but the date of its foundation is unknown. The place deserves to be noticed as the frontier town between Greece and the barbarians, in what is commonly called the peace

[1] "It is certain that in the time of the Roman emperors, the Alexandrians pronounced Alexándreia, and they probably did so even under the Ptolemies; the Alexandrian dialect is in fact the root of the modern Greek.

of Cimon. This peace probably never existed as a regular treaty of peace, but there certainly was a treaty between the Greeks and the satraps of Asia Minor, which the later Greeks, contrary to historical truth, extended into a peace.[1]

PAMPHYLIA is a country full of large and flourishing towns, of which we have numerous coins with a peculiar language, and an alphabet akin to the Greek; these coins have all the beauty of Greek art, and we may well ask, whether Greece ever had anything more beautiful. The Cilician coins, especially those of Tarsus, are of the same kind. We do not know to what race those people belonged; certain it is that they were not barbarians any more than the Lycians and Lydians. In regard to intellectual culture and political organisation, they were equal to the Greeks. Lycia had a very happy federative constitution, quite in the spirit and according to the principles of the Greeks.

CYPRUS.

The only Greek colonies in that eastern part of the sea occur in Cyprus; but we are not informed by any one author at what time they were established. The statement, that Teucer founded Salamis, refutes itself, and all the traditions about colonies referring to the Trojan times are worthless; they either mean generally that the colonies belong to a very early time, or they are inventions. We cannot now determine in what manner Salamis in Cyprus arose, and we are not in a condition to say as to whether the island of Salamis off the coast of Attica ever was sufficiently flourishing to send out colonies. The Greek settlements in Cyprus were connected with very great

[1] Comp. *Lect. on Ancient Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 9.

difficulties. We see this from the prophets, for their Chittim is no doubt Cyprus; subsequently the name became more extended, for in the books of Maccabees it also comprises Greece, including even Macedonia. Hence the name of *Citium*, the Phoenician capital of the island, is nothing else but Chittim. In the time of the prophets, the island was under the dominion of the Phoenician cities; and we may ask, how could Greeks establish themselves there? This question may be answered from the Old Testament and from the fragments of Berosus in Eusebius. It can have been no other period than that during which Nebuchadnezzar carried on his protracted wars in Phoenicia and Syria, and destroyed ancient Tyre, in consequence of which the Phoenicians were very much reduced. It is also possible that the somewhat earlier expeditions of Sanherib and Assarhaddon may have been the occasion. We know, from Berosus, that, in Olymp. 20, a Greek army landed in Cilicia, which is a sign of a commotion among the Greeks at that time, about which history furnishes no information. I connect these movements with the extensive emigration of the Greeks and Carians who entered the service of Psammetichus in Egypt. Accordingly, we may assume that the Greek settlements in Cyprus were founded between Olymp. 20 and 40; and we cannot wonder that, one hundred and twenty years later, during the war of Darius Hystaspis, the Greek towns of Cyprus had already become great.

The principal places, *Salamis* and *Amathus*, were as purely Greek as the cities in Asia Minor; *Lapathos* and others were smaller. In the time of Evagoras, after the Peloponnesian war, Salamis was the ruling city of the island, and in reality sovereign. *Soli* is absurdly connected with Solon.

In later times, Greeks and Phoenicians lived peaceably together in the island. *Citium* was the capital of the Phoenicians, and the native place of the philosopher Zeno. We have no information about the race of the native

Cyprians; but, under the predominating influence of the two ruling nations, they became partly Hellenised and partly Punicised.

Cyprus is justly called by the ancients one of the most blessed countries in the world; there are but few parts of it which are unhealthy. Its rich copper mines and its timber were of particular importance to the ancients.

PHOENICIA.

The Phoenicians extended from the frontiers of the Philistines to those of Cilicia near Myriandros. It is an ancient tradition, that they had immigrated into that country from a distance, and this tradition is confirmed by its situation; it is quite clear that they cannot have been the original natives. Of the northern towns, it is quite certain, that they were colonies of those in the south. Would that we had their history, which was quite authentic up to a very remote period! They were a nation which had been pressed onward from the south towards the north. According to a tradition in Herodotus, they had come from the Red Sea, and according to another, from the Persian gulf. The latter of these, which has much engaged the attention of modern historians, is of no value at all. It would seem most probable, that they were one of those nations that were pressed onward by the emigration of the Hycsos.

INDEX.

Abantes, 176
Abdera, 212, 233
Abella, ii. 127
Aborigines, ii. 35, 147
Abruzzi, ii. 11
Abydos, 218, 235
Academia, 99
Acanthus, 231
Acarnanes, 125, 252
Acarnania, 142, 147 foll., 265
Acciajuoli, 107
Acerrae, ii. 127, 132
Achaei, 26, 150, 154
Achaean towns in Magna Graecia, ii. 189
Achaia, 28, 30, 33, 34, 37, 79 foll., 151
Achaia Phthiotis, 162, 164
Acharnae, 92, 110
Achelous, 144, 256
Acheron, 257
Acheruntia, ii. 159
Acherusian Lake, 256
Achradina, ii. 258
Achrida, 309
Acqua di Trevi, ii. 88
Acra, ii. 264
Acragas, ii. 261
Acridophagi, ii. 340
Acroceraunia, 255
Acrocorinthus, 45, 46
Actaea tellus, 42
Acte, 35, 42, 85
Actium, 152
Acusilaus, 11
Adjectives in *ius* and *ianus*, ii. 84
Ad Martis, ii. 55
Aeas, see Aous.
Aedui, ii. 312, 317
Aegae, 80 *n.*
Aegeae (in Macedonia), 278 foll., 290
Aegean sea, 182
Aegialea, Aegialos, 34, 36, 82
Aegina, 33, 45, 54, 64, 180, 183, 196; temple of Zeus Hellenios and its sculptures, 55
Aegion, 80, 82
Aegira, 80
Aegirussa, 87
Aegyptus, 21; ii. 3
Aegyptus (the Nile), ii. 3
Aelian, 158
Aemilia, ii. 28
Aemonia or Haemonia, 132, 159, 160
Aenaria, ii. 135
Aenea, 252, 289
Aenianes, 142, 155, 172, 252
Aenos, 233
Aeolis, 145, 160, 206, 215 foll.
Aepy, 69
Aepys, 58
Aequani, ii. 123, 254
Aequi, ii. 4, 23, 119, 120
Aequi Falisci, ii. 229
Aequiculi, ii. 123, 254
Aequicus, ii. 254
Aequuli, ii. 123, 254
Aeschines, 19
Aeschylus, 119; ii. 8
Aesernia, ii. 164
Aethalia, ii. 220
Aethiopia, ii. 340
Aetna, ii. 256
Aetoli, 42, 77, 125, 137, 252, 254
Aetolia, 126, 136 foll., 252
Aetolian mountains, 157
Afri, ii. 334
Africa, ii. 327
Africanus, Julius, 51
Agamemnon's kingdom, 33
Agatha, ii. 313
Agatharchides, ii. 340
Agathocles, 88; ii. 261, 266
Agger, the, of Servius Tullius, ii. 43, 48
Agiadae, 56
Agis, 58 *n.*, 4
S. Agnolo, in Pescivendolo, 238 *n.* 2
Agora at Athens, 98; in Piraeeus, 102
Agraei, 147, 270
Agrianes, 296

Agrigentum, ii. 255, 262
Agrimensores. ii. 229
Agrippa, ii. 57, 95
Agrippina, ii. 103
Agylla, 160; ii. 223
Agyrion, ii. 270, 272
Aix, ii. 315
Alabaster, ii. 220
Alalia, ii. 278
Alaric, 50
Alemanni, 306; ii. 57, 251
Alba, 115, 126
Alba Longa, ii. 107
Alba in Picenum, ii. 28
Alban hills, ii. 12
Albanese, 301; ii. 178
Albanus Lacus, ii. 12, 51
Albanus mons, ii. 38
Alberti, Battista, 7
Alcaeus, 56, 219
Alcmaeon, 148
Alcmaeon, the Pythagorean, ii. 296
Aleria, ii. 278
Aleuadae, 164
Alexander, son of Craterus, 49
Alexander, son of Philip, 198, 264
Alexander Aetolus, 144
Alexander Severus, ii. 57
Alexandria, 223, 233, 264; ii. 344
Alexandrian School, 160, 223
Alfaterna, ii. 143
Algarvia, ii. 255
Algidus, ii. 38, 121
Alis, 77, 252; comp. Elis.
Allifae, ii. 164
Allobroges, ii. 315
Alopeconnesus, 234, 235
Alpes, 284
Alpes Maritimae, ii. 11, 17
Alpes Cottiae, Graiae, Juliae Nepontiae, ii. 18; Noricae Penninae, Raeticae, ii. 18
Alpes Apenninae, ii. 28
Alpes, a region of Italy, ii. 29
Alpis Cottia, Alpes Cottiae, region of Italy, ii. 29
Alpes Penninae, region of Italy, ii. 28
Alphabets, 302
Alpheus, 30
Alsium, ii. 223
Aluntium, ii. 270
Alyzia, 151, 152
Amalfi, ii. 167
Amantia, 306
Amasea, 20
Amastris, 250, 251
Amathus, ii. 349
Amazirgh, ii. 334
Ambracia, *see* Ampracia.
Amisus, 248, 249
Amiternum, ii. 149, 150
Ammianus Marcellinus, ii. 281
Amorgos, 190
Amphictyones, 129 foll. 252
Amphilochii, 147, 259, 263, 265, 269, 280
Amphipolis, 232, 286, 294
Amphipolis in Syria, 291
Amphissa, 124
Amphitheatrum, ii. 91
Amphitheatrum Castrense, ii. 93
Amphitheatrum Flavium, ii. 91
Amphitheatrum Statilii Tauri, ii. 91, 100
Amphitheatrum vivarium, ii. 93
Ampracia, 47, 138, 149, 263, 265, 270, 280, 307
Ampracian Gulf, 151
Ampurias, ii. 294
Amurath, 50
Amyclae, 58, 61
Anagnia, ii. 116
Anacreon, 211
Anactorion, 149, 152, 252
Anaphe, 190
Anas, ii. 283
Anauros, 160, 169
Anaxagoras, 212
Anaximander, 208
Anaximenes, 208
Ancon, 152; comp. Ancona.
Ancona, ii. 152
Andalusia, ii. 255
Andania, 69
Andros, 184, 187
S. Angelo, 63; comp. Malea.
S. Angelo in Pescaria, 238 *n.* 2
S. Angelo, castle of, ii. 101
Angli, 135
Anio, ii, 21
Anthedon, 117, 122
Anthemus, 289
Antibes, ii. 314
Anticyra, 133
Antigonea, 268
Antigonea, 73, comp. Mantinea.
Antigonids, 283
Antigonus Gonatas, 49
Antigonus Carystius, 307
Antioch, 234
Antiochus of Syracuse, ii. 188, 265
Antiparos, 186
Antipater, 292
Antipater's poem on Corinth, 50
Antipolis, ii. 314
Antium, ii. 122
Antoninus, emperor, ii. 57
d'Anville, 9, 10, 18, 45 *n.*, 168, 227, 257, 289; ii. 58, 127, 158, 340

Anxur, see Terracina.
Aones, 113
Aous, 307
Ἀπειρῶται, 252
Apelles, 210
Apennini montes, ii. 11, 18
Apia, 27
Apidanos, 160
Ἀπόκλητοι, 140
Apollo, temple of, at Gryneon, 216
Apollonia in Africa, ii. 330
Apollonia on the Aous, 273, 307, ii. 189
Apollonia in Thrace, 226
Apollonius Rhodius, 168, 175, 201, 271 *n.*, ii. 328
Apollonius, tyrant of Cassandrea, 88
Appian, 304, ii. 30, 292, 336
Apricots, 252
Apuleius, 172, ii. 338
Apuli Daunii, ii. 170
Apuli Lucani, ii. 170
Apuli Teani, ii. 170
Apulia et Calabria, ii. 28
Apulia, 252, ii. 4, 5, 7, 12, 26, 154, 159, 168
Apulus, ii. 168
Aqua Appia, ii. 87
Aqua Claudia, ii. 88
Aqua crabra, ii. 50
Aqua damnata, ii. 50
Aqua Marcia, ii. 88
Aqua Virgo, ii. 88
Aquae Sextiae, ii. 315
Aquileia, ii. 248
Aquinum, ii. 127
Aquitani, ii. 313, 317
Aquitania, ii. 313
Arabic language, ii. 205, 206
Arachthos, 256, 307
Arae Philaenorum, ii. 330
Aragonese language, ii. 299
Araethyrea, 53, comp. Phlius
Arar, ii. 316
Aratores, ii. 272
Araxus, 49, 53
Arausio, ii. 315
Arcades, 71, 75
Arcadia, 29, 30, 31, 33, 69, 70 foll.
Archaeanactidae, 246
Archelaus, 293
Archilochus, 183, 186
Archytas, ii. 186
Arctinus, 208
Ardea, ii. 109
Ardyaei, 300, 306, 311
Arelas, Arelate, ii. 315
Aremorica, ii. 318
Arena, ii. 46, 92
Areopagus, 96
Aretinus, 261, *n.* 2
Areus, Areas, 262, *n.*
Arevaci, ii. 299
Ἀργεῖοι, 26
Argentum Oscense, ii. 295
Argolis, 29, 34, 37
Argos, 25, 30, 34, 36, 37, foll., 39, 161
Argos Amphilochicum, 166, 263, 266, 270, 307
Ἄργος Ἵππιον, see Arpi
Argos in Orestis, 166, 269
Argos in Thessaly, 278
Argyripa, see Arpi
Argyrocastro, 268
Aricia, ii. 115
Arimaspae, 208
Ariminum, ii. 26, 164, *n.* 241
Arion, 220
Arisba, 218
Aristides, Aelius, 20, 293 *n.*
Aristodemus, 56
Aristodemus, tyrant of Elis, 88
Aristophanes, ii. 8
Aristoteles, 16, 23, 54, 78, 223, 255, 307, ii. 200, 296 *n.*, 331
Aristoxenus, ii. 205
Arles, ii. 315
Armorica, ii. 25
Arnauts, 301
Arndt, E. M., ii. 10
Arne, 113, 160
Arno, ii. 21, 215
Arpi, ii. 170, 172
Arpinum, ii. 119, 124, 159
Arretium, ii. 163, 213, 227
Arretium, vases of, ii. 134
Arretium, vetus, fidens, Julium, ii. 227
Arrian, 118
Arsinoe, ii. 329
Artemidorus, ii. 283
Artyni, 43
Aruaci, ii. 299
Arverni, ii. 312, 316
Arx, ii. 48, 67
Asbestus, ii. 44
Asclepiadae, 204
Asculum, ii. 151
Asia, 22
Asine, 67, 69
Asinia gens, ii. 157
Asopus, 116
Aspetus, 261
Asphalt, springs of, 305
Aspropotamo, 145, comp. Achelous
Assisium, ii. 233
Assos, 218
Astacos, 241

Asteria, 184
Astorga, ii. 302
Astures, ii. 301
Asturica, ii. 302
Ἄστυ, 93
Astypalaea, 195
Asylum, ii. 66
Atarneus, 223
Atella, ii. 127, 132
Athamania, 380, *n.* 2
Athenae, 55, 89, 93, foll.; the city of Hadrian, 96, 99; acropolis of, 97; buildings, 100, 106; population, 107; allied with Aetolia, 143
Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάς, temple of, 97
Athenaeus, 20, 54, 108, ii. 85, 205
Ἀθηναῖοι Βοιωτοί, 112
Ἀθηναῖος, 91
Athenians, 98, ii. 194
Athesis, ii. 246
Athos, 226, 229, 286
Atintanes, 269, 311
Atreids, 33
Atrium, ii. 77
Atrium Libertatis, ii. 77
Atrium Vestae, ii. 77
Attica, 84, 90, foll.
Atticus, T. Pomponius, 267, 272
Ἀττικός, Ἀττική, 91
Attius, 181
Audyeelah, ii. 335
Aufidus, ii. 22, 171
Augila, ii. 335
Augusta Taurinorum, ii. 252
Augusta Trevirorum, ii. 319
S. Augustin, ii. 87
Augustodunum, ii. 317
Augustus, 308, ii. 9, 44, 94, 96, 103, 137 *n.*, 227, 295, 296
Aula Domitiani, ii. 97
Aulaea, ii. 97
Aurelia, ii. 28
Aurelianus, ii. 58
M. Aurelius, emperor, ii. 140
Aurunci, ii. 6, 123
Ausonia, ii. 6, 123
Ausonius, ii. 242, 303
Αὐταγγελτοί, 130
Autariatae, 309
Aventinus, ii. 39, 41, 49, 100
Avernus Lacus, ii. 139
Avignon, ii. 315
Avineo, ii. 315
Avitus, ii. 311
Axius, 224, 282, 286
Azan, 71
Azanes, 71

Bacanae, lake, ii. 214
Bacchus, worship of, 233, 289
Bacchylides, 187
Badajoz, ii. 296
Baetica, ii. 282
Baetis, ii. 281, 283
Baiae, ii. 94, 138
Balari, ii. 274
Balnea, balneae, ii. 94
Βάλτος, 145, 256
Barbarians, 26, ii. 8
Barbaricini, ii. 276
Barbié du Bocage, 10, 95, 97, 118, 257, 289
Barca, ii. 329
Barcelona, ii. 293
Barcino, ii. 293
Bardylis, 300
Bari, ii. 175
Barium, ii. 175
Basilicata, ii. 182
Basilica of Antoninus, ii. 57, 84
Basilica Julia, s. L. et C. Caesarum, ii. 80
Basilica Opimia, ii. 80
Basilica Paulli, ii. 80
Basilica Porcia, ii. 80
Basilicae, ii. 79
S. Basilius, 106
Basque, ii. 302
Basque language, ii. 254, 285
Basra, ii. 198
Basse-Bretagne, ii. 25, 318
Bastarnae, ii. 325
Bastuli, ii. 288
Beaujour, Felix de, 293
Beef, 31
Beia, ii. 296
Belemina, 62
Belgae, ii. 306, 319
Belgium, ii. 10, 304
Belisarius, ii. 44
Βῆμα at Athens, ii. 74
Benacus, ii. 27
Beneventum, ii. 26, 142, 164
Bentley, Richard, 253, ii. 196
Berenice in Epirus, 268; in Cyrenaica, ii. 329
Bergamum, ii. 244
Berne, ii. 245
St. Bernard, mount, ii. 17
Beroea, 291
Berones, ii. 299
Berosus, ii. 349
Beterrae, ii. 313
Beziers, ii. 313
Bianchini, ii. 96
Bias, 209
Bituriges, ii. 303
Boccaccio, 107

Bochart, 22, ii. 268, 279
Boebeis, lake, 155, 160
Bocotarchs, 115
Bocotians, 113, foll. 123, 160
Boëthius, ii. 28
Boii, ii. 235, 236, 323
Boion, 134
Boissard, ii. 53, 105
Bolgs, ii. 306
Bomii, 138
Βωμὸς Ἐλέους, Αἰδοῦς at Athens, 98
Βωμὸς of Fama and Ὁρμή, 99
Bonaparte, Lucien, ii. 110
Bononia, ii. 234, 238
Boreas, 17
Borghese, Prince, ii. 114
Borgo, ii. 44, 46, 103
Bory de St. Vincent, ii. 294 *n.*
Borysthenis, Borysthenopolis, 243
Bosporus, 182, 236
Bosporus, kingdom of, 245
Bottiaei, Bottiaeis, 225, 288
Bottii, 226, 277
Botzen, ii. 10
Boundaries, natural, ii. 273
Bovianum, ii. 162, 163
Βουλευτήριον at Athens, 98
Βουλή, 130
Bozra, ii. 337
Brancaleone, ii. 83
Brenin, ii. 306
Brennus, 134
Brescia, 170
Breuni, 299
— *bria*, Thracian suffix for Town, 237
Brienne, 107
Brilessus, 92
Britain, 20, ii. 320
Britany, see Basse Bretagne
Britons, ii. 207, 281
Brittia, ii. 28
Brixia, ii. 234, 244
Brocchi, ii. 39, 50
Bröndstedt, 187
Bronzes, ii. 173
Brundusium, ii. 177, 179
Bruttii, ii. 28
Bruttium, ii. 26, 144, 183
Bryseae, 59
Buffaloes, ii. 233
Bullii, Bulliones, 301, 306
Bulwark of Pope Paul III., ii. 60
Bura, 29, 80
Burdigala, ii. 303, 318
Burgus, see Borgo
Burial places of the poor at Rome, ii. 46
Buschetti, ii. 218
Bushmen, ii. 340
Bustum of the Caesars, ii. 103
Butadae, 86
Buthroton, Buthrotos, 259, 267, 271 foll.
Buxentum, ii. 204
Βύρσα, ii. 337
Byzacene, Byzacitis, Byzacium, ii. 332, 338, 339
Byzantium, 237
Byzantius, Byzantinus, 238

Cabral, ii. 112
Caelius, hill, ii. 41, 100
Caelius Antipater, ii. 293
Caere, ii. 213, 223
Caesar, C. Julius, 11, 50, 51, 306, ii. 241, 303, 306, 313
Caesaraugusta, ii. 295
Calabri, ii. 177
Calabria (Terra di Lecce), 255, ii. 26, 177
Calauria, 44
Cales, ii. 128
Caligula, ii. 96, 136
Callaici, ii. 301
Callimachus, 144, 202, 269, 271 *n.*
Callipolis on the Hellespont, 236
Callipolis in Magna Graecia, ii. 185
Calor, ii. 161
Calvinists, ii. 154
Calydon, 136, 145
Camalodunum, ii. 322
Camarina, ii. 255
Cambunii montes, 157
Cameos, ii. 199
Camerinum, ii. 233
Camiros, 196
Campagna di Roma, ii. 27
Campagna di Lavoro, ii. 28
Campania, ii. 5, 26, 28
Campania Aurelia, ii. 28
Campania Romana (Romae), ii. 27
Campania suburbicaria, ii. 28
Campanian vases, ii. 133
Campi, ii. 128, 130
Campi Catalaunici, ii. 128
Campo Santo, ii. 218
Campo Vaccino, ii. 73
Campus Caelimontanus, ii. 100
Campus Esquilinus, ii. 100
Campus Martius, ii. 49, 55, 56, 95, 100
Καμπυλίδαι, 260
Camuni, ii. 244
Candauian hills, 285
Canobus, ii. 344
Canosa, ii. 174
Cantabri, ii. 302
Canusium, ii. 170, 173

Capena, ii. 213, 225
Capharean rocks, 178
Capitoline temple, ii. 67
Capitolinus, ii. 42, 65
Capua, ii. 127, 130
Caralis, ii. 276
Κάρβανοι, ii. 8
Carcer, ii. 69
Cardamyle, 69
Cardia, 234, 235
Cardinals, ii. 45
Cares, 77, 123, 184, 192, 197, 203, 205, 217
Carinae, ii. 66, 95, 99
Carpathos, 195
Carpetani, Καρπήσιοι, ii. 298
Carthaea, 141, 187
Carthago, ii. 330, 336
Carthago nova, ii. 288
Carystus, 177
Casci, Cascus, ii. 35, 123
Casilinum, ii. 127, 129
Casinum, ii. 159
Casmenae, ii. 264
Cassander, 228, 296, 297
Cassandrea, 228, 235, 298; comp. Potidaea.
Cassianus, ii. 311
Cassiopea, 263, 272
Cassiterides insulae, ii. 320
Castalia, 129
Castanea, 158
Castaneae nuces, 158
Castiglione, ii. 277, 334
Castulonensis saltus, ii. 291
Catacombs, 106; ii 46
Catalani, 107
Catalogue, see Homer
Catana, 176
Κατάπλους, ii. 136
Cato, M. Porcius, ii. 8, 141, 230, 238
Cattle, breeding of, ii. 233
Catullus, ii. 245, 246
Caucones, 26, 77
Caudium, ii. 165
Caudini, ii. 143, 161
Caulon, Caulonia, ii 189, 199
Caunii, 201
Καυσία, 292
Caystrus, 210
Celano, ii. 156.
Cella, ii. 68
Cella, Della, ii. 329
Celtae, ii. 280, 281, 298, 306, 326
Celtiberi, ii. 280, 300
Celtici, ii. 280, 298
Celtic language, ii. 305
Celtoligyes, ii. 313
Cenchreae, 45, 51
Cencius Camerarius, ii. 97 *n.*
Cenomani, ii. 236, 238
Census at Rome, ii. 72
Centaurs, 159
Centrones, ii. 50
Centumcellae, ii. 136, 223
Centuripa, ii. 271
Ceos, 184, 187
Cephaloedion, ii. 267
Cephallenia, 142, 143, 153, 154
Cephallenian islands, 153
Cephisus, 92: the Phocian, 117
Ceramicus, 97
Ceras (χρυσοῦν), 237
Ceraunian mountains, 255
Cerigo, see Cythera.
Cermalus, ii. 59
Cerynea, 80
Ceylon, ii. 274
Chaeronea, 122
Chalcedon, 238, 242
Χαλκιδῆς ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης, 225, 282
Chalcidice, 227
Chalcidian towns, in Epithrace, 176; in Sicily and Italy, 176; ii. 189
Chalcis, in Acarnania, 151, 252; in Euboea, 134, 176, 179, 183, 207, 273; in Syria, 291; alleged town in Thrace, 227
Chalk, *ii.* 39
Χάλκος, ii. 321
Champagne, ii. 128, 171
Champollion, the younger, ii. 210, 342
Chaones; comp. Chones.
Χειμάῤῥους, 144
Chemi, *ii.* 3
Cherson, 245
Chersonesus, 42
Chersonesus, town, 245
Chersonesus Taurica, 245
Chersonesus Thracica, 233
Chiós, 161, 205, 206, 213
Chittim, ii. 349
Chone, ii. 11
Chones in Italy, 260; ii. 181
Christian religion at Athens and Rome, 106
Church S. Catarina de' funari, ii. 89
Church S. Cosma e Damiano, ii. 76
Church S. Maria Liberatrice, ii. 78
Church S. Maria Maggiore, ii. 59
Church S. Salvatoris in maximis, ii. 68
Cicero, *in Clodium et Curionem*, ii. 138, 147; *pro Cluentio*, ii. 46, 96; *pro Scauro*, ii. 273, 275; *pro Tullio*, 183, 195
Cilicia, ii. 284
Cilicians, 185

Κιλλικύριοι, ii. 260
Cimariotae, 260
Cimbri, ii. 235, 312, 326
Ciminian forest, ii. 225
Cimmerii, 221
Κιμώνειον τεῖχος, 97
Cimon, peace of, ii. 348
Cios, 241
Cipollino, 178
Circaeum, ii. 39
Circus Agonalis, ii. 89, 101
Circus of Alexander Severus, ii. 101
Circus Flaminius, ii. 89
Circus Maximus, ii. 52, 88
Circus of Nero, ii. 103
Cirrha, see Crissa
Cirta, ii. 339
Cispius Mons, ii. 43
Cithaeron, 91, 116
Citium, ii. 349
Civita Castellana, ii. 230
Civita Vecchia, ii. 223; comp. Centumcellae.
Civitas added to names of towns, ii. 112
Civitates, ii. 312
Classes, ii. 239
Clay, works in, ii. 227
Clazomenae, 206, 212
Claudianus Mamertus, ii. 311
Clemens of Alexandria, ii. 9
Cleobulus of Lindos, 201
Cleomenes, 49, 62, 66
Cleomenes, architect of Alexandria, ii. 345
Cleonae, 41
Cleruchia, 181
Clientes, 43
Clientela, ii. 308
Clisthenes, 86
Clivus, ii. 48, 66
Cloacae, ii. 47
Clovis, 262
Clusium, ii. 213, 227
Cluver, Philip, 6
Cnidus, 204
Cnosus, Cnossus, 192, 193
Coae vestes, 190
Coals, 78
Codex Theodosianus, ii. 27, 29
Coins, ii. 3, 163, 172, 184, 193, 195, 199, 205, 210, 221, 265, 266, 284
Colchis, 248
Collis, i. e. Quirinalis, ii. 62
Collis Hortulorum, see Hortulorum
Cologne, ii. 295
Colonia Agrippina, ii. 320
Colonia Augusta Rauracorum, ii. 315
Colonia Maritima, ii. 122
Coloniae Civiles, ii. 315
Colonies, Greek in Italy and Sicily, 31, 177; ii. 255; in Asia Minor, 205; in Macedonia and Thrace, 224; Latin, ii. 31; Roman, ii. 125, 205, 290
Colonna, cape, 110; comp. Sunion
Colophon, 176, 206, 212
Colophonian colony in Magna Graecia, ii. 189
Κόλπος μέλας, 234
Colosseum, ii. 92
Columna Trajani, ii. 83
Κωμηδόν, 93, 210
Comitium, ii. 73, 80
Commune, 150; C. Latium, ii. 109
Comparative Ethnography, ii. 6
Compsa, ii. 166
Comum, ii. 241, 244
Conipodes, 43
Connubium, ii. 289
Consentia, ii. 184
Constantina, ii. 339
Constantinople, 238, 241; comp. Byzantium
Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 245
Constantine, emperor, 264
Conventus Civium Romanorum, 313
Copae, 122
Copais, lake, 74, 114, 117
Copts, ii. 342
Corals, banks of, ii. 274
Coral fishing, ii. 314
Corax, 186
Cordonata, ii. 65
Cordos, see Corinth.
Corduba, ii. 290
Cordubenses poetae, ii. 290
Corcyra, 47, 175 177, 272
Corcyra, town, 275
Corcyra melaena, 314
Corfinium, ii. 157
Corfu, ii. 178
Corinna, 118
Corinth, 35, 36, 38, 44, 48, 50, 68, 89, 134, 151. 207
Corinthian Gulf, 81
Coriolanus, ii. 51
Corn, ii. 283
Corn trade, 243
Corneto, ii. 222
Corniculum, ii. 38
Corone, 69
Coronelli, 8
Corphi, 274
Corsica, ii. 203, 278
Cortona, ii. 213, 227
Cos, 32, 204
Cosetani, ii 294
Cosenza, ii. 184

Κόσμοι, the, of the Cretans, 194
Cosmo, III. de Medici, ii. 215
Cossa, Cossa Volcentium, ii. 214, 221
Cothon, ii. 337
Cranae, 112
Cranai, 154
Κρατήρ, ii. 140
Craterus, 49
Cremona, ii. 238, 245, 295
Crenidas, 285
Creophilus, 209
Cresphontes, 57
Κρησφύγετον, 260
Crestonaea, 287
Crete, 48, 141, 161, 190
Κρητίζειν, 195
Crissa, 45, 127
Crissaean Gulf, 116
Cromna, 250
Cronium Mare, ii. 305
Crossaea, 287, 289
Croton, Crotona, 109, 152
Crotona, 262 *n.*
Crumentum, ii. 184
Crypta, ii. 139
Ctesicles, 108
Cumae, 176; ii. 2, 134, 151
Cuneus, ii. 92
Cures, ii. 147
Curetes, 137
Curia Hostilia, ii. 75
Curia Julia, ii. 73, 76
Curia Vecchia, ii. 95
Curius Dentatus, ii. 147
Curzola, 314
Cyclades, 114, 183
Cyclopes, ii. 253
Cyclopean, works, 40, 41, 60, 145, 154, 260; ii. 48, 109, 116, 156, 219, 275
Κυκλος, 93
Cydon, Cydonii, 192
Cydonia, 194
Cyllene, 78
Cyme Phriconis, 216
Cymri, ii. 306, 312, 318, 321
Cynaetha, 75
Cynosarges, 99
Cynurii, 41
Cyparissia, 69, 83
Cyprus, ii. 348
Cyrenaica, ii. 327
Cyrene, ii. 192, 327
Cyrillian alphabet, 302
Cyrillus, 302
Κύρνος, ii. 278
Cyrrhus in Syria, 291
Cythera, 39, 55, 63, 114, 182
Cythnos, 184
Cytinium, 134
Cytoros, 250
Cyzicus, 160, 207, 241; ii. 123

Dalmatia and Dalmatians, 305, 312
Δαναοί, 25
Dardani, 284, 304
Dardanus, 241
Daunia, ii. 4
Daunii, ii. 3
Decelea, 111
Decius, emperor, ii. 57
Delium, 122
Delos, 51, 183, 184
Delphi, 17, 126, 129, 261; ii. 223
Delta of rivers, ii. 105
Demetrias, 166, 167, 235
Demetrius Phalereus, 165
Demetrius of Pharos, 314
Demetrius Poliorcetes, 52, 53, 167, 198
Demi of Attica, 86, 110
Democritus, 233
Demosthenes, 44, 168, 197, 227, 228, 236, 246
Dessaretae, 301, 309
Diaconiae of the Christians at Rome, ii. 45
Dialect, the Laconian, 136; Latin dialects, ii. 34
Diana, at Ephesus, 210; at Rome, ii. 99
Dicaearchia, ii. 135
Dicaearchus, 121, 224
Δίγλωσσοι, 227, 267; ii. 178
Dignitaries, secular, ii. 45
Dimalon, 301
Diocletian, 313
Dion Cassius, 297
Dion Chrysostomus, 90, 242, 293
Diodorus of Sicily, 119, 126, 310; ii. 151, 152, 197, 198, 257, 259, 261, 263, 267, 271, 289, 336, 341
Diomedes, his kingdom, 33, 34, 36
Diomedes, ii. 159
Dion, 289; ii. 260
Dionigi, Madame, ii. 118
Dionysius I., ii. 260
Dionysius II., ii. 260
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 94; ii. 48, 109, 211, 221, 224
Dionysius Periegeta, ii. 200
Dionysius Thrax, 175
Dioscuria, 248
Dodona, 160, 173, 254
Dodwell, 158
Dolonces, 234
Dolopes, 155, 172, 184 *n.*, 252, 280
Dolopian mountains, 157

Domitian, ii. 29, 83; Aula Domitiani, ii. 97; Statua equestris, ii. 71
Donati, ii. 67
Doria, river, ii. 253
Dorians, 192, 196, 203
Doris, 134
Dositheus magister, 175 *n.*
Drachmae and tetradrachmae of Athens, 104
Drepana, ii. 268
Drepane, 272
Drino, 284, 312
Druids, ii. 308
Dryopes, 41; in Messenia, 67, 173, 184
Dulichium, 146
Dureau de la Malle, ii. 66
Durius, ii. 283
Durocortorum, Durocortoro, ii. 310, 319
Durra, ii. 330
Dwarf palm, ii. 255
Dyme, 80
Δυναστής, 219
Dyrrachium, 308; comp. Epidamnus

Earth, notions of the ancients of, 15; earliest division of, 22; in a burning state, 307
Ecetrae, ii. 122
Echinades, 145, 148
Edessa, 277, 291
Edetani, ii. 291
Edones, 288
Egesta, ii. 269
Egribos, 180
Eichhorn, K. F., ii. 119
Εἴδωλον, 97
Einsiedlen, itinerary of, ii. 101
Eion, 232
Eionae, 42
Ἐκκλησία, 180
Elatea, 132
Elea in Oenotria, 212; ii. 189, 204; comp. Velia
Eleus, 234
Eleusis (Eleusina), 90, 92, 109
Eleutherae, 112
Eleutherolacones, 62
Elimiotae, 277, 278, 282
Elis, 30, 34, 36, 77; κοίλη, 59; town, 78
Emathia, 277, 286
Emerita Augusta, ii. 295
Emporiae, ii. 294
Empti venditi, ii. 36
Encheleans, 299
England, ii. 45, 187, 281
Ἐνιῆνες, 172
Enna, ii. 271
Ἐννέα ὁδοί, see Amphipolis
Ennius, 158, ii. 77, 177
Epaminondas, 66, 75, 118
Epeans, 34, 77
Ephesus, 210
Ephorus, 32, 57, 153
Ephyra, 44
Epidamnus, 273, 308
Epidaurus, 38, 42; temple of Aesculapius, 44
Epidaurus Limera, 62
Epipolae, ii. 258
Epirus, 142, 251
Epirotae, 125, 275
Eratosthenes, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 81, ii. 188, 304
Erchomenos, 122, see Orchomenos.
Erechtheum, 97
Eretria, 176, 177, 278, 277
Eridanus, ii. 20
Erineos, 134
Erymanthus, 30
Erythea, ii. 287
Erythrae, 120, 206
Eryx, ii. 257
Esquiliae, ii. 66, 96
Esquiline, ii. 43, 100
Eteobutadae, 87
Eteocretes, 191, 192
Ἔθνος, 132
Etruria, ii. 26, 206
Etrusci, 48, 191, ii. 4, 10, 23, 234
Etruscan walls, ii. 48, 219; columns, 77; language, 209; writing, 220
Euboea, 175
Eubocan sea, 116
Eudyeelah, ii. 335
Eudoxus, 19
Eucnus, 137, 145
Euganei, ii. 247
Eugubinian Tables, ii. 210
Eumenes, 235
Eunuchs, 211
Euripides, 119
Euripus, 178
Europe, 22, 23
Eurotas, 30, 59, 60
Eurypontids, 56
Eurysthenes, 56
Eurytanes, 138
Eusebius, 51, 166, ii. 349

Fabius Maximus, ii. 39
Fabius Pictor, ii. 124, 170
Fabrataria, ii. 119, 126
Fabretti, ii. 50
Faesulae, ii. 163, 214, 215, 228
Falera, ii. 230

Falernian wine, ii. 128
Falernus ager, ii. 127, 132
Falisci, ii. 229
Fanum, ii. 241
Fasti Capitolini, ii. 76, 110, 226
Fasti of the Venetian consuls, ii. 248
Fasti of Verrius Flaccus, ii. 111
Fasti Triumphales, ii. 116
Faun, the Barberini, ii. 102
Fauriel, 258
Fauvel, 96
Faventia, ii. 237, 239
Favissa, ii. 69
Fea, ii. 60, 70
Fellatah, ii. 340
Felsina, ii. 234, 238
Ferentinum, ii. 66, 116, 118
Festus, ii. 159
Feudalism, 37
Ficoroni, ii. 59, 70
Firbolgs, ii. 306
Fire, the, of Nero, ii. 55, 96
Firn, ii. 117
Flaminia, ii. 28
Flamininus, T. Quinctius, 63
Florentia, ii. 163, 228, 237
Florentines, ii. 16, 206
Florus, ii. 56
Fora, ii. 237
Formiae, ii. 124, 139
Fornix Fabianus, ii. 98
Forum, meaning of, ii. 80
Forum Augusti, ii. 47, 81
Forum Aurelium, ii. 85
Forum Boarium, ii. 85
Forum Caesaris, ii. 81
Forum Cornelii, ii. 239
Forum Domitiani, ii. 80
Forum Julii, ii. 315
Forum Nervae, ii. 80, 83
Forum Olitorium, ii. 85
Forum Palladium, ii. 83
Forum Popillii, ii. 239
Forum Romanum s. Maximum, ii. 81
Forum Trajani, s. Ulpium, ii. 80
Fossa Cluilia, ii. 50, 51
Fossa Quiritium, ii. 51
France, population of, ii. 145
Franks, 306, ii. 5, 145
Frascati, ii. 109
Fratres populi Romani, ii. 317
Fregellae, ii. 119, 124, 159
Fregenae, ii. 223
Frejus, ii. 315
Frentani, ii. 4, 24, 143, 158, 161
Frisians, ii. 251
Frontinus, ii. 56
Fronto, 293 *n.* ii 310
Frusino, ii. 116
Fucinus, lake, ii. 156
Fulginium, ii. 233
Fulvius, Andreas, ii. 67, 72, 137, *n.*
Funchal, ii. 60
Fundi, ii. 124

Gabii, ii. 38, 113
Gades, ii. 287
Gael, ii. 306, 318
Gaetuli, ii. 333, 335
Γαλάται, ii. 306
Galatia, ii. 325
Galli, ii. 306, 321
Gallia, ii. 303
Gallia Cisalpina, ii. 9, 232
Gallia Cispadana, ii. 24, 236
Gallia Lugdunensis, ii. 311
Gallia Narbonensis, ii. 311
Gallia Togata, see Gallia Cisalpina.
Gallia Transpadana, ii. 24, 236, 241
Gallipoli, ii. 185, comp. Callipolis.
Γάμοροι, ii. 260
Gamucci, ii. 82
Garamantes, ii. 335
Gardens, see Horti.
Garganus, ii. 4, 171
Garigliano, ii. 22
Garve, ii. 168
Gatterer, 276
Gela, ii. 255, 264
Gell, Sir William, 154
Genauni, 299
Geneva, ii. 125
Genua, 43, ii. 251
Geranean mountains, 29
Germa, ii. 335
Germani, ii. 306
Germania prima, ii. 320
Germania secunda, ii. 320
Gesner, J. M., ii. 84
Getae, ii. 324, 326
Γετῶν ἐρημία, 243
Gigantes, ii. 253
Glagolitian alphabet, 303
Glass, ii. 335
Gnosus, Gnossus, see Cnosus
Goethe, ii. 53
Gold mines, 91, 285, 295; ii. 283; in rivers, ii. 283; gold sand, ii. 253
Gomphi, 156
Gonfalina, ii. 215
Gortyn, Gortyna, 193
Gothofredus, Jac., ii. 29
Goths, 106, 123, 311; ii. 11, 19, 58
Gracchus, C., ii. 75
Graeculi, ii. 94, 123, 141
Γραικοί, 25
Gras, 217
Greece, 7, 24

Grecks, 43, 49
Greek language in Southern Italy and Sicily, ii. 144
Gregory the Great, ii. 58, 94, 137, 272, 276
Gregory of Tours, ii. 10, 317
Gronovius, J. F., 238
Grotta Ferrata, ii. 50
Gryneon, 216
Gubbio, ii. 210, 233
Guilletière, de la, 8
Guiscard, Robert, 50
Gytheion, 61

Hadria, ii. 153
Hadrian, emperor, 73, 96, 105
Hadrian I., pope, ii. 93
Hadrumetum, ii. 332
Haedui, see Aedui.
Haemonia, 132, 159; comp. Aemonia.
Haemus, 284
Halesa, ii. 270
Haliae, 42; 44; Ἁλιῆς, 44
Haliaemon, 286
Haliartus, 121
Haliartus, lake of, 117
Halicarnassus, 203
Haller of Nürnberg, 187
Halonnesus, 181
Halys, 249
Hamilcar Barcas, ii. 257, 289
Hannibal, 265; ii. 19, 59, 132, 183, 199, 289
Harpocration, 86, 163
Hausmann, ii. 133
Hebrus, 283
Hecataeus of Miletus, 11, 13, 17, 23, 307
Hecatonnesus, 215, 217
Ἕδος, ii. 68
Εἵλωτες, 59
Helice, 28, 80, 81
Helicon, 116, 128
Hellanicus, Phoronis, 160
Hellas, see Greece
Ἑλλὰς συνεχής, 24
Ἕλληνες, Ἕλλοι, 25
Hellenistic dialect, ii. 280
Hellespont, 182
Helos, 58, 59
Helvetii, 311
Heneti, ii. 247
Henna, ii. 270, 271
Hephaestia, 181
Heraclea in Bithynia, 245
Heraclea in Chersonesus, 245
Heraclea in Magna Graecia, ii. 189
Heraclea on the Liburnian coast, 312
Heraclea ἐν Μαριανδύνοις, 250
Heraclea in Sicily, ii. 264
Heraclea ἡ ἐπὶ Τραχῖνι, 142, 143, 171
Heracleia, 114
Heracleids, 36
Heraclitus, the philosopher, 210
Heraea, 143
Heraean hills, ii. 255
Heraeon in Samos, 210
Hercules, 114
Hermione, Hermion, 38, 42, 43
Hernae, ii. 117
Hernici, ii. 38, 116
Herodes Atticus, 50, 99, 105
Herodotus, 13, 17, 18, 23, 47, 56, 72, 107, 120, 126, 135, 155, 168, 172, 224, 299; ii. 211, 212, 267, 343,
Hesiod, 52, 216; ii. 36
Hesperia, 22
Hestiaea, 178
Hestiaeotis, 161
Heyne, 127; ii. 39, 196
Hiera, 190
Hierapytna, ii. 35
Hierian islands, ii. 314
Hiero II., ii. 260
Hieronymus of Cardia, 235
Highlanders of Scotland, ii. 306
Hills of Rome, ii. 41
Himera, 176; ii. 266
Himerius, 106
Hindoo, 156
Hippo, ii. 332, 338
Hippodamus of Miletus, 101
Hipponax, 210
Hipponium, ii. 189, 203
Hirpini, ii. 26, 143, 151, 161, 165
Hirpus, ii. 230
Hirt, A., ii. 81
Hispalis, ii. 290
Hispalli, ii. 123, 141
Hispania, ii. 279
Hispania citerior, ii. 302
Hispania Tarraconensis, ii. 293
Hispania ulterior, ii. 302
Hispellum, ii. 233
Holstenius, Lucas, ii. 230
Homer, 15, 22, 25, 32, 52, 111, 120, 148, 151, 162, 173, 176, 196, 224, Hymn on Apollo, 183, 253; comp. Iliad, Odyssey
Homeridae, 213
Honey, 92
Honorius, ii. 58
Horatii and Curiatii, ii. 51
Horace, ii. 43, 165, 175, 231
Horti, ii. 53
Horti Aemilii, ii. 54
Horti Sallustiani, ii. 59
Hortulorum mons s. collis, ii. 43, 57

Hottentots, ii. 340
Huesca, ii. 295
Humbert, ii. 336
Humboldt, Wil. von, ii. 279, 283
Hume, ii. 45, 129
Huns, 123, 311
Hyantes, 113
Hycsos, ii. 342
Hydrea, Hydra, 44, 54
Hydruntum, ii. 179
Hyes, 113
Hyginus, Julius, ii. 117, 224
Hyle 120
Hylice, 117
Hylli, 269, 299, 305, 313
Hymettus, 91
Hypate, 172
Hyperboreans, 17
Hyperides, 82
Ὑποθῆβαι, 119

Ialysos, 196
Janiculus, ii. 44
Jansenists, ii. 154
Janus dexter, sinister, ii. 61
Iapydes, 299
Ἰαπυγία ἀκτή, ii. 177
Iapygian promontory, ii. 176, 199
Iapyx, ii. 171
Jason of Pherae, 164
Iberia, ii. 279
Iberians, ii. 254, 279, 312, 322
Iberus, ii. 279, 282
Ida, 193
Idubeda, ii. 299
J. Jerome, 51, 302
Jerusalem, 17
Jesuits, ii. 154
Iguvinian tables, ii. 210, 233
Jinghis Khan, 310
Iguvium, ii. 233
Ilerda, ii. 294
Ilergetes, ii. 294
Ilias, 173, 214, comp. Homer
Ilion, 218
Ilisus, 92
Illyrians, 48, 297, 311, ii. 324
Illyrian language, 302
Illyrian mountains, 304
Illyricum, Ἰλλυρίς, 267, 297
Ilva, ii. 220
Imbros, 105, 181
Inachus, 307
Inferum mare, ii. 22
Inscription of Protogenes, 244
Inscriptions, 270 *n.*; ii. 110, 221, 275, 284, 285, 334
Insubres, ii. 236, 238
Interamna, ii. 147
Interamnium, ii. 126
S. John, Evangelist, 211
Iolcos, 167, 168, gulf of, 159
Ionia, 79, 84, 161, 205
Ionians, 84
Ionian colonies in Magna Graecia, ii. 189
Ios, 189
Josephus, ii. 337
Ireland, ii. 321
Iron, ii. 220
Ischia, 177
Iscipio, ii. 279
Isis of Elephantine, ii. 341
Isopolity, 138, 140
Ispahan, ii. 198
Issa, 312
Isthmus of Corinth, 45
Istria, 304, ii. 249
Itali, ii. 6, 179
Italians, 43, ii. 37
Italica, see Corfinium
Italica in Spain, ii. 302
Italici, ii. 6
Italiots, ii. 181
Italus, ii. 1, 3
Italy, 101, ii. 1, 10, 14, 23, 25, 129, 256
Ithaca, 143, 153
Ithome, 65, 68; temple of Zeus Ithomatas, 68
Ithopya, ii. 340
Itinerary of Einsiedlen, ii. 101
Judges, books of, ii. 337
Iulis, 187
Jus Latii, ii. 32
Jus Municipii, ii. 32
Justin, 263, 309
Jüthungi, ii. 57
Juturna, well of, ii. 77
Juvenal, ii. 7, 62, 155

Koosh, ii. 341
Kopitar, 302

Labeatis, lake, 312
Laborde, Alex., ii. 294, *n.*
Labyrinth, 194
Lacedaemon, κοίλη, 59
Lacetani, ii. 294
Lacini, ii. 33
Lacinium, ii. 109
Lacinus, ii. 34
Laconia, 56
Lacus Curtius, ii. 78
Lacus Servilius, ii. 75
Lakes, with subterraneous outlets, 29

Lampsacus, 241
La'ncisa, ii. 215
Languages, affinities of, ii. 305; roots of, ii. 307
Languedoc, ii. 145
Lanuvina, 237
Lanuvium, ii. 113
Lanzi, ii. 209
Laocoon, group of, ii. 96
Laos, ii. 189, 192, 203, comp. Laus.
Lapathos, ii. 349
Lapithae, 159, 160
Laplace, 46 *n.*
Larissa, arx of Argos, 40
Larissa, in Thessaly, 161, 164, 167
Las, 58
Lateran, ii. 80
Latin dialects, ii. 34
Latin grammar, ii. 36
Latin language, 261, ii. 25
Λατίνη, ii. 30
Latins, ii. 3
Latin confederacy, ii. 31
Latin colonies, ii. 31
Latinitas, ii. 33
Latinum nomen, ii. 31
Latinus, ii. 36
Λάτιον, ii. 30
Latium, 115, ii. 5, 26, 30, 51, 105
Laurentum, ii. 109, 122
Laurion, 91
Laus, ii. 22, comp. Laos.
Laus Pompeii, ii. 244, comp. Lodi.
Lavici, ii. 34
Lavini, ii. 33
Lavinium, ii. 33, 109, 122
Lebadea, 122, comp. Livadia.
Lebedos, 211
Lechaeon, 45, 51
Legio, ii. 297, comp. Leon.
Leleges, 26
Lembi, 300
Lemnos, 105, 160, 180, 181, ii. 207
Leo IV., ii. 58
Leon, the Salaminian, 111
Leon, in Spain, ii. 171, 297
Leon, Isla de, ii. 287
Leonessa, ii. 19
Leontini, ii. 255, 266
Leontion, 80
Leopold II., ii. 215
Leopolis, ii. 223
Lepanto, 124, *n.*, comp. Naupactus
Lepreon, 79
Leptis, ii. 332
Λεπτόγεως, 92
Lerida, ii. 294
Lesbos, 180, 217
Lessing, ii. 39
Leucaethiopes, ii. 340
Leucas, Leucate, 47, 148, 149, 151, 152, 252
Leuctra, 121
Levant, ii. 334
Lex Aelia Sentia, ii. 33
Lex de Gallia Cisalpina, ii. 238
Lex Julia, ii. 32
Lex Junia Norbana, ii. 33
Leyden, ii. 198
Libanius, 106
Libethrides, 288
Libri pontificii, ii. 36
Liburnians, 272, 299, 304, ii. 3, 246
Liburnicae, 300 *n.*
Libyans, ii. 274
Libye, 22
Λιβύες, ii. 334
Λιβυφοίνικες, ii. 274, 333
Libyan Alphabet, ii. 284
Licentia poetica, ii. 231
Light-house in Pharos, ii. 346
Ligorio, Pirro, ii. 76
Ligures, ii. 16, 24, 217, 234, 312
Liguria, ii. 9, 27, 249
Lilybaeum, ii. 268
Lime, ii. 39
Lime-stone mountains, 305
Limes, ii. 320
Limnae, 61
Lindos, 196
Linen, ii. 292
Lingones, ii. 236
Linternum, ii. 127
Lipsius, ii. 73
Liris, ii. 22, 128
Lissus, 312
Livadia, 117, comp. Lebadea
Livonia, ii. 37
Livy, 264, 281, 296, ii. 48, 173, 225, 238, 293
Locati conducti, ii. 36
Locri Narycii, 125, ii. 200
Locri Epicnemidii, 123
Locri Epizephyrii, ii. 189, 200
Locri Opuntii, 123
Locri Ozoli, 123, 142, 252, ii. 200
Locrian colonies in Magna Graecia, ii. 189
Lodi, ii. 244, comp. Laus Pompeii
London, ii. 47, 56, 322
Longobardi (Lombards), ii. 5, 11, 73, 58
S. Lorenzo, ii. 278
De Luc, ii. 18
Luca, ii. 216
Lucan, 313, ii. 241, 255
Lucani, ii. 5, 145, 170, 180
Lucania et Brittia, ii. 28
Lucania, ii. 26
Luceria, ii. 159, 174

Lucerum, ii. 41
Lucian, ii. 136, 346
Lucretius, ii. 246
Lucumo, ii. 307
Lucus Capenas, ii. 62
Ludi Magni Romani, ii. 88
Ludi plebeii, ii. 88
Ludias, 286, 292
Lugdunum, ii. 316
Luna, ii. 216
Lungara, ii. 58
Lusitani, ii. 297
Lycaeus, 30
Lyceum at Athens, 99
Lychnidas, 309
Lycians, 192
Lyctus, 192, 194
Lycurgus, 128, 191
Lydians, 206, 217
Lyncestians, 277, 278, 282
Lyons, ii. 295, 316
Lysander, 122
Lysimachia, 234.

Macar, 218
Macedonia, 275
Macellum, ii. 85
Mac Gregor, clan of, 266
Μάχαιρα, 301
Machiavelli, ii. 228
Macra, ii. 24
Macrii, 175
Macris, i.e. Corcyra, 175, 272
Maeander, 206
Maecenas, his palace, ii. 54
Maenalii, 71
Maenalus, 30
Magal, ii. 337
Magister vici, pagi, ii. 86
Magna Graecia, ii. 188
Magnesia in Asia, 168
Magnesia on the Maeander, 220
Magnesia near mount Sipylus, 221
Magnesia in Thessaly, 165, 166
Magnetes, 155, 164, 252, 277
Mahomed, 107, 234
Malacca, ii. 288
Malea, cape, 60
Μαλιακὸς κόλπος, 159, 171
Malii, 155, 171, 252
Maltese language, ii. 338
Maluentum, ii. 142, 164
Mamertini, ii. 8, 265
Mamertus, see Claudian
Manduria, ii. 179
Manii, 305, 313
Mannert, 10
Mantinea, 73; lake of, 39
Mantua, ii. 24, 234, 245
Maps of Ptolemy, 5; the most ancient Latin, 5; Greek, Arabic, 5; of the Greeks, 17
Marathon, 92, 110
Marble, 91, 177, 186, ii. 267
Mare inferum, ii. 22
Mare superum, ii. 22
Mare Tuscum, ii. 22
Mare Tyrrhenicum, ii. 22
Maremma, ii. 214
Marcotis, ii. 342
Mariana, ii. 279
S. Marino, ii. 114
Marinus of Tyre, 21
Marliani, Bartholom., ii. 67, 72
Marmarica, ii. 336
Marmor Parium, ii. 267
Maronea, 233
Marrana, ii. 49, 50
Marrucini, ii. 23, 26, 142, 153
Marruvium, ii. 156
Marshes, Pontine, ii. 138
Marsi, ii. 4, 24, 26, 142, 145, 153, 155
Martial, ii. 62
Martius, Campus, comp. Campus Martius
Massacsyli, ii. 334
Massalia, 212, ii. 314
Massic wine, ii. 128
Massilia, 212, ii. 314, comp. Massalia
Massyli, ii. 334
Mastrucae, ii. 276
Μάσυες, ii. 334
Matapan, cape, 30
Matrona, ii. 318
Μαυροί, ii. 334
Mausoleum Augusti, ii. 101
Mausoleum of Hadrian, ii. 101
Μάξυες, ii. 334
Mazirgh, ii. 334
Mazzocchi, ii. 209
Mecklenburg, ii. 208
Meconc, 52, comp. Sicyon
Meddix Tutix, ii. 171
Medici, Princes of, ii. 215
Mediolanum, ii. 242, comp. Milan
Mediterranean Sea, tides in the, ii. 331
Medma, ii. 189
Megalopolis, 75, 169
Megara, 87, 237
Megara, suburb of Carthage, ii. 337
Megaris, 84, 87
Mela, Pomponius, 11
Melanogaetuli, ii, 333, 335
Melcarth, 182
Meleager, 137

Melesigenes, 214, comp. Homer
Meletios of Janina, 8, 122, 257
Melii, 171
Melite, 314
Melos, 180, 189
Melpum ii. 234, comp. Milan.
Melville, general, ii. 18
Membliarus, 190
Memnon, 198
Memphis, ii. 344
Menapii, ii. 319
Mende, 228
Menelaus, 33, 60
Meones, 205, ii. 207, 211
Meonia, 168
Merida, ii. 295
Meroe, ii. 341
Mesembria, 242
Messana, ii. 255, 262, comp. Zancle.
Messapia, ii. 177
Messe, 59
Messene, Messenia, 36, 64, 125; the town of Epaminondas, 66, 68
Messenian wars, 65
Metapontum, ii. 189, 193
Metathesis, ii. 112
Methodius, 302
Methone in Messenia, 67, 69
Methone in Pieria, 224, 289
Methymna, 220
Metrodorus of Scepsis, ii. 226
Mexicans, ii. 208
Mexico, 191
Migrations of nations, 310
Milan, ii. 241, comp. Mediolanum.
Milanese, ii. 242
Miletus, 206, 248
Millot, ii. 275
Milo, see Melos.
Mimas, 215
Mimnermus, 212
Minius, ii. 283
Minos, 190, 191
Minturnae, ii., 132
Minutius Felix, ii. 106
Minyes, 74, 77, 114; ii. 190; Thessalian, 160
Mirus, ii. 242
Misitra, 61; comp. Sparta.
Missolonghi, 145
Mitylene, 219
Μιξέλληνες, 226, 242, 314
Mnaseas, ii. 180
Modern Greek, 261 *n.*; pronunciation, 124 *n.*
Modon, see Methone in Messenia.
Moenia, ii. 65, 262
Moles Hadriani, ii. 101
Molochath, ii. 334
Molotti, Molossi, 254, 259, 261, 268
Molottian dogs, 258
Molottian kings, 263
Monembasia, 62; see Epidaurus Limera.
Mons Albanus, ii. 38
Mons Testaceus, ii. 137
Monte Cavo, ii. 38; see Mons Albanus.
Monte S. Giuliano, ii. 257; comp. Eryx
Monte Testaccio, ii. 137
Monti Latini, ii. 38
Monumentum Ancyranum, ii. 72
Mopsopia, 85
Morea, 27
Morelli, ii. 70
Morgetes, ii. 181
Moriah, hill, ii. 48
Morosini, 8
Moscow, ii. 344
Motye, ii. 267
Mucianus, ii. 40
Müller, Johannes, ii, 326
Müller, C. O., 276
Mulucha, ii. 334
Mummies, ii. 342
Munda, ii. 291
Munychia, 100
Murcia, ii. 49
Murus Servii regis, ii. 48, 49
Murviedro, ii. 293
Muscles, development of, ii. 16
Museum in Athens, 96, 99
Musimon, ii. 273
Mutina, ii. 234, 238
Mycale, 209
Mycalessus, 122
Mycenae, 33, 35, 38, 41, 114
Myconos, 184, 187
Mygdonia, 277, 288, 294
Mylae, ii. 267
Mylitta, 182
Myriandros, ii. 350
Myrina, 181
Myron, 210
Mysi, 205
Mytilene, see Mitylene
Myus, 208
Mzirgh, ii. 334

Nabis, 56, 63
Naphtha, springs of, 154
Naples, population of the kingdom, ii. 252
Naples, city, 43, 177
Napoli di Malvasia, 62
Nar, ii. 21
Narbo, Narbo Martius, Narbona, ii. 313, 315

Nardini, ii. 67, 70, 73
Narnia, ii. 233
Naryx, 125; ii. 200
Nasamones, ii. 335
Nasos, ii. 258
Naucratis, ii. 347
Naumachia, ii. 103
Naupactus, 66, 125, 142
Nauplia, 41
Navale, ii. 103
Navarino, 70
Naxos, island, 180, 184, 188
Naxos in Sicily, 176; ii. 255, 264
Neapolis, part of Syracuse, ii. 258
Necropolis of Alexandria. ii. 53
Negroponte, 180
Nelids, 33
Nemausus, ii. 313, 315
Nemi lake, ii. 12, 115
Νεώσοικοι, 101, 105
Nepet, ii. 225
Nequinum, ii. 233
Neri, 107
Nero, ii, 96; his golden house, ii 97; his palace, 97
Neriton, 151
Nersae, ii. 120
Nesis, ii. 135
Nesti, 305, 313
Nestor, 77
Netherlands, ii. 145, 187
Nestos, 281, 282, 286
New York, ii. 192
Nibby, ii. 44, 59
Nicaea, ii. 314
Nicander, 223
Nicopolis, 152
Nicolo Pisano, ii. 218
Niebuhr, B. G. 303 *n.*
Niger, ii. 335
Nigritae, ii. 335
Nile, 19, 23; ii. 343
Nisaea, 87
Nisita, ii. 135
Nismes, ii. 313, 315
Nisyros, 195
Nizza, ii. 314
Nola, ii. 132
Νομάδες, ii. 334
Nomen Latinum, Fabium, etc., ii. 32
Nomentum, ii. 38
Νόμος, ὁ κοινὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων, 131
Nonius, ii. 159
Nora, ii. 276
Noraces, ii. 274
Noricum, ii. 313
North wind, 16
Notion, 212
Notitia imperii, ii. 28
Notus, 17
Novocomum, ii. 244
Nuceria, ii. 143, 166
Numantia, ii. 300
Numbers, Greek, signs of, 163
Numidae, ii. 334
Numidia, ii. 334
Nursia, ii. 120
Nymphaeum, 307

Obelisk, ii. 89
Obotritae, ii. 251
Odessus, 243
Odyssey, 192, 253; comp. Homer
Odysseus, 148
Oeneus, 137
Oeniadae, 138, 145, 149, 150
Oenoe, 111
Oenotria, ii. 3, 179
Oenotrians, ii. 180
Oeta, 116, 128, 157
Oetaei, 172
Ofanto, ii. 22
Ogygia, 184
Olbia, 243; inscription of, ii. 304, 325
Olenus, 80, 81
Olisipo, ii. 297
Olives, in Peloponnesus, 31; in Argolis, 40; in Corinth, 51; Sicyon, 52, 131 *n.*; in Italy, ii. 15, 151, 176; Africa, ii. 339
Olympia, 79
Olympian games, 79, 128
Olympieum, 97, 99
Olympus, 17, 155, 157, 287
Olynthus, 227
Ὀμβρικοί, ii. 233
Onean mountains, 29
Onomarchus, 132
Opica, ii. 6
Opicans, ii. 4, 7, 23, 123
Opican language, ii. 5
Opici mures, ii. 7
Oppius mons, ii. 43
Opus, 125
Oranges, ii. 315
Orbelos, 283
Orchomenos in Arcadia, 41, 74
Orchomenos in Boeotia, 74, 114, 122
Ὀρείχαλκος, ii. 321
Oreos, 178
Orestis, 166, 259, 265, 269, 280, 283
Oretani, ii. 298
Oricus, 268
Orneae, 41
Oropo, 113
Oropus, 112
Orosius, ii. 80
Orospeda, ii. 282

Orpheus, 287
Orthagoras, 53
Ortygia, comp. Delos, 184
Ortygia in Sicily, ii. 257
Orviedo, ii. 221
Osca, ii. 295
Oscan language, ii. 34, 168
Oscense argentum, ii. 295
Oscans, see Opici
Ossa, 155, 158
Ostia, ii. 106, 136
Othrys, 155, 156
Otranto, ii. 179
Ottilienberg, ii. 235
Ovid, 242, 271
Oxylus, 77, 137

Pace, Roman, 46, *n.*
Padus, ii. 20
Paeones, 286, 287, 288, 297
Paestum, ii. 205, comp. Posidonia
Pagae, (Pegae), 88
Pagasae, 165, 167
Pagasaean gulf, 155, 165
Pagus, ii. 86
Painters, school of, at Sicyon, 52; at Bologna, ibid.
Palace of Nero, ii. 99
Palace of Titus, ii. 99
Palaepolis, ii. 140
Palatinus, ii. 41, 96
Palazzuolo, ii. 108
Pale, 154
Pale-burghers, ii. 119
Palestrina, 237, ii. 112
Pallene, 226, 280
Palmerius, see Paulmier
Pamisus, 30, 64, 67
Pamphylia, ii. 348
Panaetolium, 147
Panacton, 111
Pandionids, 85
Pangaeus, 284, 285
Panionium, 215
Pannonii, 297
Panormus, ii. 268
Pantani, ii. 47
Pantheon of Agrippa, ii. 56, 95, 101
Panvini, ii. 96
Parauaei, 263, 265, 269
Parian Chronicle, ii. 267
Parma, ii. 234, 238
Parnassus, 116, 128, 157
Parnes, 92
Paros, 182, 184, 186
Parrhasii, 71
Parrhasius, 210
Parthenii, ii. 187, 201
Parthenon, 98
Parthenope, ii. 139
Parthini, 300, 306, 311
Passaro, 263, 267
Passeri, ii. 209
Patavium, ii. 246, 247
Patrae, 80, 82
Patres conscripti, ii. 36
Patrimonium D. Petri, ii. 28, 214
Paul III., bulwark of, ii. 60
Paulmier de Grentemesnil, 7, 275
St. Paul, Apostle, ii. 136
Paulus Diaconus, ii. 27
Pausanias, 90, 96, 120
Pavia, see Patavium
Pax Augusta, ii. 296
Pax Julia, ii. 296
Pedasos, 69
Pegae, see Pagae
Pelagonii, 269
Pelasgi, 25, 71, 77, 160, 180, 182, 184, 192, 204, 220, 227, 253, 287, 299; ii. 3, 23, 151, 175, 207
Πελασγικὸν τεῖχος, 97
Pelasgiotis, 161
Pelasgian endings,—*entum*—*untum*, ii. 109
Pelasgus, 27
Pelion, 158
Peligni, ii. 4, 23, 26, 142, 153, 155
Pella, 229, 282, 286, 289, 291
Pellana, 62
Pellene, 80, 82
Pelopidas, 118
Pelopidae, 217
Peloponnesians, 135
Peloponnesus, 26, 30
Pelops, 27, 43, 217
Pelorus, cape, ii. 255
Penelope, 154
Peneus, 155, 158
Penestae, 43
Πενεστεία, 161
Pentadactylon, 30
Pentelicus, 91
Pentrians, ii. 161
Peparethus, 181
Peraebi, Peraebia, 155, 160, 164, 166
Pergamus, kingdom of, 221
Pergamus, Pergamum, town, 221, 222
Pergamus, kings of, 55
Pergamus, school of, 222
Periander, 49
Perinthos, 236
Περίοδοι γῆς, 12
Περίπλοι, 12
Περίπλους περὶ Πόντου Εὔξεινου, 248
Perizonius, 7

Perrevos, 258
Persius, ii. 220
Peru, 191
Perusia, ii. 213, 227
Peruvians, ii. 207
Petelia, ii. 184
Peter the Great, 294
Petit-Radel, ii. 156
Petronius, ii. 140
Peucetii, ii. 3, 170, 175
Phaeaces, 272
Phalantus, ii. 186, 201
Phalerus, 55, 95, 100
Phanagoria, 246
Pharae, 80
Pharos, 312, 314
Pharos, near Alexandria, ii. 346
Pharsalus, 161, 164, 165, 167
Phaselis, 203, ii, 347
Phasis, river, 23
Phasis, town, 248
Pheidon, 38
Pheneus, 75
Pherae in Laconia, 58, 69
Pherae in Thessaly, 161, 164, 167
Pherecydes, historian, 11
Pherecydes, philosopher, 187
Phigalea, 76, 143
Philadelphia, ii. 192
Philaeni, altars of, ii. 330
Philetas, 271 *n.*
Philip of Macedonia, 280
Philippi, 91, 285, 295
Philomelus (Philonomus?), 58
Phintias, ii. 264
Phlegra, 226
Phlegraean fields, ii. 12, 128
Phlius, 36, 53
Phocaea, 212
Phocians, 123
Phocis, 126
Phoenice on the Adriatic, 267
Phoenicia, ii. 350
Phoenician settlements in Africa, ii. 332
Phoenicians, 114, 182, 184, ii. 254, 332
Phrynichus, 208
Phthia, 162
Phthiotans, 155
Phthiotis, 142, 159, 161, 162
Phylarchus, ii. 347
Phyle, fort in Attica, 110
Phylae in Attica, 86
Piazza Navona, ii. 89
Piceni, ii. 24, 142
Picentini, ii. 161, 166
Picenum, ii. 26, 150
Picenus, ii. 28
Picts, ii. 321
Pictures, galleries of, ii. 96
Piedmontese, ii. 16
Pieria, 224, 277, 286, 288
Pierides, 288
Pietramala, 307
Pimplea, 287
Pimpleides, 288.
Pincius mons, if. 43
Pindar, 118; ii. 328
Pindus, 128, 135, 156, 255
Piraeeus, 94, 100
Piranesi, ii. 59
Pirates, 199, 300 *n.*
Pirene, 51
Pisa in Elis, 79
Pisa in Etruria, ii. 198, 217
Pisatis, 77
Pisaurum, ii. 241
Piscivendulus, 238 *n.*
Pithecusae, ii. 135
Placentia, ii. 237, 238, 295
Plains in Attica, 92; in Boeotia, 117; in Thessaly, 155
Plan of ancient Rome, ii. 77
Plataeae, 112, 115, 120
Platea, ii. 87
Plato, ii. 260
Plautus, miles gloriosus, 52
Πλήμμυρα, 144
Pleuron, 136, 145
Pliny, the elder, 11, 255, 278, 304, 309; ii. 25, 38, 39, 49, 55, 168, 169, 172, 251, 310
Pliny the younger, ii. 57, 242
Plutarch, 47, 118
Pnyx, 96, 99
Pococke, Richard, 8
Podium, ii. 92
Poediculi, see Peucetii
Poggio, ii. 92
Pola, ii. 9
Polar circles, 19
Polichna in Megaris, 87
Polichna in Crete, 191
Πολίχνιον, 134
Πόλις, 93, 260
Πολιτεία, 140
Pollentia, ii. 237
Polybius, 19, 60, 76, 79, 81, 82, 118, 137, 143, 146, 149, 174, 254, 308; ii. 1, 2, 9, 31, 146, 197, 200, 235, 246, 249, 267, 292, 298
Polycletus, 210
Pomoerium, ii. 56
Pompeii, ii. 34, 52, 140, 166
Pompey, 82
Pomponius; see Mela

Pomerania, ii. 208
Pons Aelius, ii. 63, 64, 105
Pons Cestius, ii. 105
Pons Fabricius, ii. 105
Pons Milvius, ii. 104, 105
Pons Palatinus, ii. 104
Pons Senatorius, ii. 105
Pons Sublicius, ii. 51, 103
Pontine Marshes, ii. 138
C. Pontius, ii. 146
Pontos Euxeinos, 207
Population of Greece, 121; of France, ii. 145
Populonia, ii. 212, 220
Populus Romanus Quirites, ii. 36
Porphyry, 60
Porta Aelia, ii. 63
Porta Appia, ii. 63
Porta Ardeatina, ii. 63
Porta Asinaria, ii. 63
Porta Aurelia, ii. 63
Porta Caelimontana, ii. 60
Porta Capena, ii. 54, 60, 62
Porta Carmentalis, ii. 51, 61, 62
Porta Collina, ii. 59, 62
Porta Esquilina, ii. 59
Porta Flaminia, ii. 63, 89
Porta Flumentana, ii. 60, 62
Porta Labicana, ii. 63
Porta Latina, ii. 63
Porta Metronia, ii. 63
Porta Mugonia, ii. 59
Porta Naevia, ii. 60, 61, 62
Porta Nigra at Treves, ii. 62
Porta Nomentana, ii. 63
Porta Ostiensis, ii. 63
Porta Pinciana, ii. 62
Porta Portuensis, ii. 63
Porta Praenestina, ii. 63
Porta Rauduscalana, ii. 61, 62
Porta Salara, ii. 57, 63
Porta S. Giovanni, ii. 63
Porta S. Lorenzo, ii. 63
Porta S. Pancratii, ii. 63
Porta S. Pauli, ii. 63
Porta S. Sebastiani, ii. 63
Porta Septimiana, ii. 63
Porta Tiburtina, ii. 63
Porta Trigemina, ii. 61, 62, 99
Porta Valeria, ii. 63
Porticus round the Forum, ii. 78
Porticus of Octavia, ii. 100
Portolani del Mare, 13
Portus Romanus, ii. 106, 135, 223
Ποσειδῶν Ἐνοσίχθων, 28, 81
Posidonia, ii. 189, 192, 205, 208
Posidonius, 20; ii. 280, 316
Potidaea, 224, 226, 227, 228
Pouqueville, 307
Praefectura Romana, ii. 164
Praeneste, ii. 32, 38, 111; Praenestine dialect, ii. 34; Forum, 111
Praesos, 191
Praetutii, ii. 153
Prasiae, 62
Prasias, lake, 296
Praxiteles, 121
Prevesa, 152
Priene, 209
Prisci, ii. 35, 123
Prisci Latini, ii. 36
Priscian, ii. 159
Priscus, ii. 35
Privernum, ii. 119
Prochyta, ii. 135
Procles, 56
Procopius, ii. 11, 27, 63, 93, 243
Προμαντεία, 129
Proni, 154
Propertius, 271 *n.*
Propontis, 207, 237
Πρόσχωσις, ii. 39
Πρωτεύοντες, 245
Provençal language, ii. 310
Provincia Romana (Gaul), ii. 311
Provincia suburbicaria, ii. 27
Prumnis, 38
Prytaneum at Athens, 98
Pseudo-Philip, 293
Psophis, 75, 143
Ptolemais, ii. 330
Ptolemais (Egypt), ii. 344
Ptolemy, geographer, 21; ii. 340
Ptolemy Soter, 291
Puig, ii. 93
Pulytion, 101
Puplana, see Populonia
Purple dyeing, ii. 187
Puteoli, ii. 136; comp. Dicaearchia.
Puy, ii. 93
Puycerda, ii. 93
Pydna, 224, 289
Πυλιακὸς κόλπος, 159, 171
Pylian kingdom, 34
Pylos, the Messenian, 69
Pylos, the Triphylian, 69
Pyramid, 46 *n.*
Pyrgi, ii. 223
Pyrrhus of Epirus, 266
Pythagoras, 209
Pythagorean writings, ii. 184
Pythagoreans, ii. 197
Pytheas, 19; ii. 321
Pytho, 128; comp. Delphi.
Pyxus, ii. 189, 204

Quinarii, Illyrian, 309
Quinctilian, 118

Quirinalis mons, ii. 41, 61, 99
Quirium, ii. 41

Raeti, ii. 212
Raetia prima, secunda, ii. 27
Ragusa, 54; ii. 178
Raphael Volterranus, 5
Rasena, ii. 211
Ravenna, 145, 160; ii. 9, 20, 123, 239
Ré, del, ii. 112
Reate, ii. 150
Regia, ii. 77
Regio transpadana, ii. 26
Regiones Italiae of Augustus, ii. 26
Regiones of Severus, ii. 27
Reguli, ii. 285
Reichardt, 10
Relegatio, ii. 279
Religion of Ceres and Proserpina, ii. 271
Remi, ii. 319
Rennell, 9
Rhacotis, ii. 345
Rhamnus, 110
Rhegium, 176; ii. 189, 202
Rheims, ii. 310
Rhenea, 184, 185, 187
Rhine, country of the, ii. 145
Rhion, cape, 30, 124
Rhode, ii. 294
Rhodope, 283
Rhodes, 32, 196, 198, 199
Rhodes, town, 197
Rhypes, 80
Rimini, ii. 241
Roche, Otto de la, 106
Rogus, 271
Roha, 291
Rome, 96, 101, 115, 126, 306; ii. 41, 129, 198, 230, 267
Roma, ii. 41
Romance languages, ii. 310
Romania, ii. 239
Rostra, ii. 74, 76, vetera et nova, 76
Rubicon, ii. 9
Rudiae, ii. 177
Ruscllae, ii. 212
Russian alphabet, 302

Sabellian tribes, ii. 5, 23, 141
Sabine language, ii. 5, 23, 141
Sabines, ii. 149
Sactabis, ii. 292
Safinim, ii. 158
Sagra, ii. 197
Saguntum, ii. 292
Sais, ii. 344
Salamanca, ii. 298
Salamis, island, 86, 90, 111, 112
Salamis, in Cyprus, ii. 348, 349
Salapia, ii. 174
Salassi, ii. 249
Salernum, ii. 161, 166
Salentini, ii. 177
Sallentum, ii. 178
Sallust, ii. 6, 150, 333
Salmantica, ii. 298
Salmasius, ii. 165
Salona, Salonae, 303, 313
Salt, ii. 187
Saltpetre, ii. 176
Same, 153, town, 154, comp. Cephallenia.
Samnites, ii. 5, 141, 145, 157, 162
Samnium, ii. 5, 26, 28
Samos, 180, 204, 209
Samothrace, 182; ii. 269
Samuel, books of, ii. 337
Saone, ii. 316
Sappho, 152, 219, 220
Saragoza, ii. 295
Sardi montani, ii. 274
Sardinia, ii. 273
Sardinian language, ii. 277
Saronic gulf, 46
Sarsina, Sassina, ii. 232
Saticula, ii. 127
Saturnia, ii. 214
Sauini, ii. 158
Σαύνιον, Σαυνῖται, ii. 158
Savigny, ii. 241
Savini, ii. 158
Savoy, ii. 10
Saw mills, ii. 309
Saxons, ii. 321
Scala, ii. 100
Scaliger, 238
Scardus, 157, 283, 284
Scepsis, 218
Scheria, 272
Scholæ Saxonum, ii. 103
Scholiast of Juvenal, ii. 159
Scholiast of the Odyssey, ii. 180
Scholiast of Virgil, ii. 116, 155
Scholiasts, ii. 240; of Apollonius and the Iliad, 160
Sciathos, 180
Scidros, ii. 189
Scillus, 79
Scione, 228
Sciri, ii. 325
Scironian rocks, 90
Scodra, 301, 312
Scolos, 120
Scomius, 284
Scopades, 164
Scopelos, 180
Scotland, ii. 321
Scriptores historiae Augustae, ii. 26

Scriptores rei agrariae, ii. 28
Scriptores rei rusticae, ii. 177
Scupi, 283, 285
Scylax of Caryanda, 12, 19, 23, 44, 67, 79, 150, 155, 168, 188, 229, 298; ii. 143, 158, 312
Scylletion, ii. 189
Scymnus, 38, 42, 248, 298
Scyros, 105, 173, 180
Scythae, 244, 310; ii. 8, 326
Segesta, ii. 269
Segre, ii. 293
Seleucus, 291
Selinus, ii. 255, 264
Sellasia, 62
Selle, ii. 204; comp. Elea
Σελλοί, 25
Selymbria, 237
Semita, ii. 65
Sena Gallia, ii. 241
Sena Julia, ii. 226
Seneca, ii. 290
Senones, ii. 236
Septa, ii. 100
Septimontium, ii. 42
Sequana, ii. 319
Sequani, ii. 312, 316, 317
Seres, 231, 233
Seriphos, 184, 186
Serrae, 231
De Serre, ii. 74
Servitude, 205
Servius, 260; ii. 116, 120, 159
Servius Tullius, wall of, ii. 49
Sesamos, 250
Sestos, 234, 235
Shakespere, 107
Shaw, 8
Shilha, ii. 334
Sibylla, 212
Sicani, ii. 254
Siceli, ii. 253
Sicilia, ii. 253
Sicilienses, ii. 270 *n.*
Siceliotae, ii. 270 *n.*
Sicily, ii. 256; the two Sicilies, 181
Sicoris, ii. 293
Siculi, ii. 3, 4, 35, 180, 254, 270
Sicyon, 30, 34, 37, 38, 51
Σιδηροφορεῖν, 125, 137
Sidicini, ii. 128
Sidonius Apollinaris, 292 *n.*
Sierra Morena, ii. 280
Sigonius, ii. 32
Sila, forest, ii. 19
Silarus, ii. 22, 23
Silius Italicus, ii. 241
Silver mines in Attica, 91, 295; in Siphnos, 186; in Spain, ii. 283; in Thasos, 183; in Thrace, 183, 284, 285
Simonides, 187
Singitian gulf, 286
Sinope, 249
Sinuessa, ii. 132
Siphnos, 184, 186
Sipontum, ii. 174
Siris, ii 189
Siritis, ii. 192
Sismondi, ii. 37 *n.*
Sithonia, 226, 229, 230, 280
Slaves, in Aegina, 54; Athens, 108, 119; Italy, ii. 183; Corinth, 108
Slave trade in Delos, 185
Slavery, 205
Slavonian languages, 303
Smyrna, 214
Social War, 240; ii. 113, 151
Sol, temple of, ii. 99
Soli, ii. 349
Solinus, ii. 59
Solocis, ii. 267, 268
Sophocles, 36
Sora, ii. 120, 126, 159
Sostratus of Cnidus, ii. 346
Σωτῆρες θεοί, ii. 347
Spalatro, 314
Spain, ii. 279
Spania, ii. 280
Spaniards, ii. 285
Sparta, 33, 36, 58, 60
Spartan kings, 58, *n.*
Spartus, ii. 283
Spercheus, 160
Spezzia, 44, 54
Sphacteria, 69
Spoletium, ii. 233
Spon and Wheler, 8
Sporades, 183
Stadium, 45 *n*, 1; at Athens, 97
Stagira, 231
Statius, ii. 72, 204
Στενὰ τῆς Ἀντιγονείας, 268
Stenyclaros, 69
Stephanus Byzantinus, 261
Sthenelus, 33, 34
Στοὰ βασίλειος, ii. 79
Store Seitz, ii. 37
Strabo, 11, 20, 58, 86, 90, 101, 162, 173, 218, 249, 275, 277, 283, 297, 304, 305, 307; ii. 17, 140, 144, 161, 163, 173, 174, 177, 242, 282, 294, 304, 336
Strategi, in Phocis, 132
Stratos, 142, 150
Streets of the Romans, ii. 63
Στροβιλοειδής, 221
Strymon, 231, 282, 286

Strymonian gulf, 281
Stuart, 96
Stymphaei, 258, 269
Stymphalian lake, 29, 74
Stymphalus, 74
Styra, 178
Styx, 257
Subura, ii. 66, 98, 99
Suburbicariae provinciae, ii. 27
Suburbs of Rome, ii. 51, 54, 100
Sulphureous springs, 146, 189
Summer at Rome, ii. 57
Suetonius, ii. 3, 76
Sulci, ii. 276
Suliots, 258
Sulmo, ii. 157
P. Sulpicius, 55
Ser. Sulpicius, 55, 90
Sulpicius Severus, ii. 25
Sunium, 91
Superum mare, ii. 22
Surrentum, ii. 166
Sutrium, ii. 225
Switzerland, French part of, ii. 10
Sybaris, ii. 181, 189, 190
Syme, 32
Sympolity, 140
Synesius, ii. 329
Συνοικισμός, 294
Syracuse, 47, 161: ii. 255, 257; population, 261; province, 268
Syros, 184, 187
Syrtes, 256

Tabernae, s. mensae argentariorum, ii. 77
Tacitus, 11; ii. 302, 306, 312, 319, 321, 322
Taenarus, 28, 30, 60
Ταγός, 164
Tagus, ii. 282, 283
Taman, Tamacan, 247
Tamyrace, 247
Tanagra, 122
Tanais, 23; town, 247
Taphians, 148
Tar, manufacture of, ii. 185
Taraco, ii. 293
Tarentum, ii. 185
Tarpeian rock, ii. 66
Tarpeius mons, ii. 41
Tarquinii, ii. 212, 222
Tarquinius, father or son, ii. 47
Tarquinius Priscus, ii. 59
Tartessus, ii. 287
Tauchira, ii. 329
Taulantii, 300, 305, 306, 308
Ταυρική, 244
Taurini, ii. 252
Taurisci, ii. 325
Ταῦροι, 244
Tauromenium, ii. 266
Taygetus, 28, 30, 31, 60, 66
Teanum, ii. 128
Teate, ii. 157
Tectosagae, ii. 304
Tegea, 72
Τεῖχος, 111
Telegonus, 153
Telemachus, 154
Temenus, 57
Temese, ii. 220
Temnos, 216
Tempe, 174
Temple of Aesculapius, ii. 104
Temple of Apollo at Gryneon, 216
Temple of the Palatine Apollo, ii. 217
Temple, the Capitoline, ii. 67
Temple of Concordia, ii. 77
Temple of Diana, ii. 99; of Diana Aricina, ii. 113; of Diana at Ephesus, 210
Temple of Juno Lacinia, ii. 199
Temple of Juno Lanuvina, ii. 113
Temple of Jupiter Latiaris, ii. 108
Temple of Jupiter Stator, ii. 76
Temple of Castor, ii. 72, 76, 77
Temple of Mars Ultor, ii. 82
Temple of Roma and Augustus, ii. 293
Temple of Saturn, ii. 77
Temple of Sibylla, ii. 112
Temple of Sol, ii. 99
Temple of Venus Erycina, ii. 257
Temple of Venus Genitrix, ii. 81
Temple of Vesta, ii. 75
Temples, Roman, ii. 68
Templum (the Rostra), ii. 74
Templum Minervae Medicae, ii. 95
Tenea, 51
Tenedos, 215, 217, 218
Tenos, 184, 187
Teos, 211
Terni, see Interamna.
Terra di Lavoro, ii. 12; comp. Campagna di Lavoro.
Terra di Lecce, ii. 176
Terra d'Otranto, ii. 176
Terracina, ii. 119, 122, 123
Tetradrachmae, 281; comp. drachmae.
Τετραρχία, 163
Teucrian Trojans, 287
Teutones, ii. 235, 326
Teverone, see Anio.
Tharyps, Tharypas, 261
Thasos, 114, 182
Theagenes, 88
Theatre at Athens, 98; in Piraeeus, 102
Theatre of Marcellus, ii. 90, 100

Theatre of Pompey, ii. 90, 100
Theatres in Rome, ii. 90
Thebe in Phthiotis, 171
Thebes in Egypt, ii. 343
Thebes in Bœotia, 114, 118, 120; ii. 261
Themistius, 292 *n.*
Themistocles, 100
Theodosia, Theudosia, 246
Theophrastus, 220
Theopompus, 158, 163, 253, 298, 300
Thera, 28, 64, 189
Therma, Thermitani, ii. 266
Therma (Thessalonica), 225, 282, 286, 295
Thermae, ii. 94
Thermae of Agrippa, ii. 56, 95, 101
Thermae of C. and L. Caesar, ii. 95
Thermae of Caracalla, ii. 95
Thermae of Decius, ii. 99
Thermae of Diocletian, ii. 95
Thermae of Nero, ii. 95
Thermae of Alexander Severus, ii. 95, 101
Thermae of Septimius Severus, ii. 95
Thermae of Titus, ii. 94, 95
Thermae of Trajan, ii. 99
Thermaic gulf, 225, 286
Thermon, 146
Thermopylae, 129; pass of, 157
Θέρος χρυσοῦν, ii. 193
Thespiae, 115, 121
Theseus, temple of, at Athens, 98 *n.*, 107
Thesprotia, 256
Thesprotians, 160, 254, 259, 260
Thessalians, 113, 132, 160; ii. 123
Thessaliotis, 161, 162
Thessalonica, see Therma.
Thessaly, 142, 155, 224, 280, Κοινὸν Θεσσαλῶν 161, fasti of the strategi, 166, Thessalian women, 172
Θολερός, 145
Θόλος, 98
Thrace, 224, 280
Thracians, 232, 277, 287, 288; ii. 8.
Thria, 92
Θριάσιον πεδίον, 92
Thrinacia, ii. 257
Thucydides, 1, 26, 42, 44, 92, 94, 110, 124, 125, 126, 136, 137, 138, 147, 150, 164, 172, 173, 184, 190, 225, 251, 254, 260, 284; ii. 172, 181, 186, 255, 256
Thurii, ii. 189, 195
Thuscia suburbicaria, ii. 28, 214
Thybris, see Tiber.
Θυεῖν, ii. 85
Thyrea, 39
Tiber, ii. 21, 46, 49
Tiberina insula, ii. 49, 104
Tiberius, emperor, ii. 96
Tibullus, ii. 29
Tibur, ii. 32, 111
Tiburnus, see Anio.
Ticinum, ii. 241
Ticinus, ii. 236
Tides in the Mediterranean, ii. 331
Timaeus, 128, 298
Timber, 295
Timoleon, 49; ii. 261
Tin, trade in, ii. 320
Tiparenus, 44
Tiryns, 34, 38, 41, 114
Tisamenus, 57
Tivoli, ii. 29, 38, 82
Tmarus, or Tomarus mons, 260, 269
Τοιχώρυχος, 101
Toledo, ii. 298
Toletum, ii. 298
Tolemata, ii. 330
Tolosa, ii. 317
Tomb of Hadrian, ii. 101
Tomi, 242
Toronean gulf, 231, 286
Torona, 230
Totila, ii. 58
Tournefort, 8
Trachinians, 142
Trachis, 171
Tractus Aremoricus, ii. 318
Trajan, ii. 57
Trajan, column of, ii 84
Transpadani, ii. 32, 236, 238
Trans Tiberim, ii. 44, 54
Trapani, ii. 268
Trapezus, 248
Trastevere, ii. 44, 58, 103
Treres, 221
Tretus, 39
Treves, ii. 320
Treviri, ii. 319
Triballi, ii. 235, 326
Tribus Materina, ii. 232
Tribus Quirina, ii. 149
Tribus Sapinia, ii. 232
Tribus Velina, ii. 232
Tricca, 162, 167
Trichonis, Lake, 146
Trinacia, ii. 257,
Trinacria, ii. 257
Triphylia, 33, 34
Triphylians, 70, 77, 79
Tripodes, 87
Tripolis, ii. 332
Tritaea, 80
Triumphal Fasti, ii. 116, 160, 177
Triumphal arch of Caligula, ii. 96
—————— Constantine, ii. 99

Triumphal arch of Gratian, ii. 99
——————— Septimius Severus, ii. 99
——————— Titus, ii. 99
——————— Trajan, ii. 84, 99
——————— Valentinian, ii. 99
Troezen, 38, 42
Trogus Pompeius, 264
Trojan war, 217
Trojans, 27
Tuder, ii. 233
Tufo, ii. 39, 46
Tunese language, ii. 338
Tunis, Tunes, ii. 332, 339
Tunny fisheries, 239, 250
Tunnel of lake Copais, 117; of the Alban lake, ii. 50, 108, 114
Turduli, ii. 291
Turia, ii. 283
Turingi, ii. 251
Turini, ii. 211
Turkish language, ii. 205
Turni, ii. 211
Turnus, ii. 170
Tusci, ii. 26, 211
Tuscia, ii. 26; comp. Thuscia
Tuscia et Umbria, ii. 27
Tusculana, scil. civitas, 237
Tusculum, ii. 109, 211
Tycha, ii. 259
Tymphaea, see Stymphaea.
Τυραννὶς, 88
Τύραννοι in Phocis, 132
Tyras, 243
Tyrrheni, 181, 191, 231; ii. 3, 33, 37, 120, 205, 207, 292
Tyrrhenicum mare, ii. 22

Ufens, ii. 40
Ulpium, not Ulpianum, Forum, ii. 83
— *ulus*, the termination, ii. 168
Umbri, ii. 11
Umbria, ii. 231
Umbro, river, ii. 232
University at Athens, 105
Utica, ii. 332

Vaccaei, ii. 298
Valentia, ii. 291
Valeria, ii. 28
Valesius see Valois.
Valois, the brothers, 7
Varro, ii. 52, 142, 177
Varus, river, ii. 9
Vascones, ii. 302
Vasilipotamos, 60; comp. Eurotas.
Vaticanus mons, ii. 44
Vaudoncourt, 257
Veii, ii. 213, 224
Velabrum, ii. 47
Velia, ii. 98
Velia, ii. 204; comp. Elea.
Velinus, ii. 147
Velitrae, ii. 38, 120
Velleius, ii. 144, 160
Vendée, 311
Veneti, ii. 11, 24, 238, 246
Venetia, ii. 25, 27
Venetia et Histria, ii. 27
Venice, 43, 102; ii. 217, 249
Venusia, ii. 159, 174
Ver sacrum, ii. 144, 151
Verona, ii. 24, 234, 243, 245
Verulae, ii. 116
Vestini, ii. 24, 26, 142, 153
Vesulus, ii. 121
Vetulonium, ii. 221
Via Aelia, ii. 63
Via Aemilia, ii. 28
Via Appia, ii. 51, 53, 62
Via Ardeatina, ii. 63
Via Aurelia, ii. 28, 29
Via Campana, ii. 63
Via Cassia, ii. 63
Via di' Cerci, ii. 89
Via Domitiana, ii. 29
Via Egnatia, ii. 283
Via Flaminia, ii. 28, 63
Via Labicana, ii. 62
Via Latina, ii. 51, 62
Via Nomentana, ii. 62
Via Ostiensis, ii. 63
Via Portuensis, ii. 63
Via Praenestina, ii. 62
Via Sacra, ii. 66, 98
Via Salaria, ii. 62
Via Tiburtina, ii. 62
Via Valeria, ii. 29, 62
Vibo Valentia, ii. 203
Vicus Cornelius, ii. 86
Vicus Patricius, ii. 86
Vicus Scleratus, ii. 86
Vienna, ii. 316
Viminalis mons, ii. 42, 99
Vindelici, ii. 324
Vine, cultivation of in Boeotia, 117; in Italy, ii. 14; in Peloponnesus, 31
Virgil, 125, 158; ii. 34, 42, 48, 55, 120, 146, 200, 229, 234, 245, 254, 262
Vitelliu, ii. 3
Vitellia, ii. 3
Vitellius, Vitalus, ii. 3
Vitulus, ii. 3
Volaterrae, ii. 212, 219
Volcanic veins, 146; in Italy, ii. 12, 38

Volsci, ii. 23, 119
Voltaire, ii. 6
Voss, J. H., 12, 22; ii. 124
Vulsinii, ii. 213, 214, 225; lake, ii. 214, 225
Vulturnum, ii. 127
Vulturnus, ii. 22, 128

Wall of Servius Tullius, ii. 49; of Aurelian, ii. 58, 62; of Honorius, ii. 58
Wallace, ii. 129
War, the Sacred, 133; the Lamian, 139
Washington, 129
Wasiliki, 53
Water, quantity of at different periods, 29
Watering places, ii. 94
Water mills, ii. 309
Wendish language, ii. 25, 298
Westphalia, ii. 301
Wheler, 8
Wieland, 233
Wik, Wich, ii. 36
Winds, 15
Wolf, Fr. A., 253; ii. 196
Wood, trade in, 295
Wool, Spanish, ii. 283

Xanthus of Lydia, ii. 214
Xenophon, 79, 104, 126, 150, 173, 229
Ξόανον, 97

Zacynthus, 143, 151, 153, 154
Zama, ii. 339
Zancle, 65, 176; ii. 255, 264
Zeno, the Stoic, ii. 349
Zephyrium, cape, ii. 200
Zeugitana, ii. 339
Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος, 121
Zmyrna, 245
Zoëga, ii. 70
Zurlo, Count, ii. 163

THE END.

WERTHEIMER AND CO., PRINTERS, FINSBURY CIRCUS.

00032718

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016